

SUPPLEMENTS TO  
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

---



# Grace and the Will according to Augustine



LENKA KARFÍKOVÁ

---

BRILL

## Grace and the Will according to Augustine

Supplements  
to  
Vigiliae Christianae

Texts and Studies of  
Early Christian Life and Language

*Editors*

J. den Boeft – B.D. Ehrman – J. van Oort  
D.T. Runia – C. Scholten – J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 115

# Grace and the Will according to Augustine

*By*

Lenka Karfíková

*Translated by*

Markéta Janebová



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Karříková, Lenka.

Grace and the will according to Augustine / by Lenka Karříková.

p. cm. – (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 0920-623X ; v. 115)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-22533-6 (alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-22921-1 (ebk) 1. Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. 2. Grace–Biblical teaching. 3. Grace (Theology)–History of doctrines–Early church, ca. 30-600. 4. Free will and determinism–Religious aspects–Christianity–History of doctrines–Early church, ca. 30-600. I. Title.

BR65.A9K375 2012

234'.1–dc23

2012004209

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see [www.brill.nl/brill-typeface](http://www.brill.nl/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978 90 04 22533 6 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 22921 1 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Socrates explains that he who does not do the right thing has not understood it; but Christianity goes a little further back and says, it is because he will not understand it, and this in turn is because he does not will the right. And in the next place, describing what properly is defiance, it teaches that a man does wrong although he understands what is right, or forbears to do right although he understands what is right; ... So then, Christianly understood, sin lies in the will, not in the intellect; and this corruption of the will goes well beyond the consciousness of the individual.

Søren Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*, II,A,2  
(English translation by W. Lowrie)



## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	XI
Abbreviations of Periodicals and Series .....	XIII
Introduction .....	1

### PART ONE

#### “NOTHING ELSE DO I HAVE BUT WILL” (386–395)

1. God As the Guarantor of the World Order and the Giver of Knowledge (Philosophical Dialogues from Cassiciacum in 386) .....	7
1.1. Happiness As <i>Deum habere</i> ( <i>De beata vita</i> ) .....	9
1.2. Perfect Order ( <i>De ordine</i> ) .....	10
1.3. God As the Giver of Knowledge ( <i>Soliloquia</i> ) .....	12
2. The Universe of Will (Works before Augustine’s Ordination As Presbyter: 387–390) .....	15
2.1. The Image of God in Man ( <i>De quantitate animae</i> ) .....	16
2.2. The Origin of Evil in the Will and Good Will As Happiness ( <i>De libero arbitrio</i> I) .....	18
2.3. The Love of God Poured Out into Human Hearts ( <i>De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum</i> ) .....	23
2.4. The Crevice in the Universe of Will ( <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> ) .....	25
2.5. The Analysis of the Will according to <i>De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII</i> 1–61 .....	28
2.6. <i>Gratia</i> As Grace in <i>De vera religione</i> .....	30
3. Pauline Themes (the Period of the Presbyterate: 391–395) .....	35
3.1. “I Do What I Will Not to Do” ( <i>De duabus animabus, Contra Fortunatum, De libero arbitrio</i> III) .....	35
3.2. The Adoption of Men As Sons of God ( <i>De fide et symbolo, De sermone Domini in monte, Enarrationes in Psalmos</i> 1–32, <i>De Genesi imperfectus liber</i> ) .....	45



3.3. Augustine's Expositions of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians .....	49
3.3a. <i>Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos</i> .....	51
3.3b. <i>De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII</i> 66–68; 76 .....	55
3.3c. <i>Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio</i> .....	59
3.3d. <i>Epistolae ad Galatas expositionis liber unus</i> .....	61

## PART TWO

## "THE GRACE OF GOD CONQUERED" (395–411)

1. Answer to Simplicianus .....	71
1.1. Romans 7 ( <i>Ad Simplicianum</i> I,1) .....	72
1.2. Romans 9 ( <i>Ad Simplicianum</i> I,2) .....	75
2. <i>Confessions</i> .....	89
2.1. God's Presence in Man ( <i>Confessiones</i> I) .....	90
2.2. Evil for Evil Itself ( <i>Confessiones</i> II–VII) .....	91
2.3. Conversion ( <i>Confessiones</i> VIII) .....	93
2.4. "Grant What You Command, and Command What You Will" ( <i>Confessiones</i> IX–X) .....	97
2.5. Eternity and Time ( <i>Confessiones</i> XI–XIII) .....	99
3. Other Works from the Beginning of the Episcopate .....	105
3.1. The Anti-Manichaean Polemic .....	107
3.1a. The "Merit of Faith" and the Fulfilment of the Law .....	107
3.1b. Adoptive Sonship .....	108
3.1c. The Gift of Light .....	110
3.1d. God Does Not Depend on Man .....	111
3.2. Grace Given Gratis ( <i>Enarrationes in Psalmos, In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos</i> ) .....	112
3.3. Vindication of Grace ( <i>Adnotationes in Iob</i> ) .....	116
3.4. Causes Hidden in God ( <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> I–IX) .....	118
3.5. Grace Excluding Pride ( <i>De virginitate</i> ) .....	124
3.6. Grace for Grace ( <i>Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium</i> 1–16) .....	126
4. Anti-Donatist Works .....	133
4.1. The Sacrament of Grace and Grace Itself .....	136

4.2. The Catholic Church and the "Columba" .....	141
4.3. Persecution .....	145
4.4. Impact on the Will and Theology of Violence .....	147
4.5. The Answer to Simplicianus and the Anti-Donatist Polemic ...	152

## PART THREE

## "THE WILL IS PREPARED BY THE LORD" (411–430)

1. Polemic against Pelagius and Caelestius (411–418) .....	167
1.1. Inherited Sin ( <i>De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum</i> ) .....	172
1.2. God Persuades the Will ( <i>De spiritu et littera</i> ) .....	181
1.3. Wounded Nature ( <i>De natura et gratia</i> ) .....	187
1.4. Can Man Avoid Sin? ( <i>De perfectione iustitiae hominis</i> ) .....	191
1.5. Pelagius' "Hypocrisy" ( <i>De gestis Pelagii</i> ) .....	195
1.6. Cognitive and Affective Grace ( <i>De gratia Christi et de peccato originali</i> I) .....	200
1.7. Infants Must Bear Sin ( <i>De gratia Christi et de peccato originali</i> II) .....	204
2. Other Works from the Period 411–430 .....	213
2.1. The Origin of Individual Souls ( <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> X, Ep. 166 and 190, <i>De anima et eius origine</i> ) .....	214
2.2. The Grace of Seeing God and the Grace of God's Presence in Man ( <i>De videndo Deo, De praesentia Dei</i> ) .....	224
2.3. The Grace of the New Testament ( <i>De gratia Novi testamenti</i> ) ...	228
2.4. Christian Existence As a Struggle with Concupiscence ( <i>Sermones</i> 151–156 on Rom. 7:5–8:17) .....	232
2.5. The Image of God in Man and the Gift of the Spirit ( <i>De Trinitate</i> ) .....	239
2.5a. The Image of God .....	240
2.5b. The Turning of the Will and the Gift of the Holy Spirit ...	242
2.5c. The Gratuity of Grace and Human Merits .....	245
2.6. <i>Attractio voluptatis</i> ( <i>Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium</i> 17–124) .....	248
2.7. "Good Concupiscence" ( <i>Enarrationes in Psalmos</i> 118) .....	254
2.8. The Dialectic of Will and Grace ( <i>De bono viduitatis, Ep. 157, De patientia, Enchiridion ad Laurentium, Retractationes</i> ) .....	257
2.9. The Epopee of Grace and Condemnation in <i>De civitate Dei</i> .....	266

2.10. Correspondence with the Monks of Hadrumetum and Gaul....	278
2.10a. The Gift of Will ( <i>De gratia et libero arbitrio</i> , <i>De correptione et gratia</i> ) .....	278
2.10b. Grace and Predestination ( <i>De praedestinatione</i> <i>sanctorum, De dono perseverantiae</i> ) .....	286
3. Polemic against Julian of Eclanum (419–430) .....	297
3.1. “I” and Concupiscence ( <i>De nuptiis et concupiscentia</i> ) .....	298
3.2. Between Manichaeism and Pelagianism ( <i>Contra duas</i> <i>epistulas Pelagianorum</i> ).....	307
3.3. Concupiscence and Guilt ( <i>Contra Iulianum</i> ).....	312
3.4. Enslaved Freedom ( <i>Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum</i> ).....	319
Conclusion .....	337
Epilogue: Augustine As a Philosopher of the Will .....	347
Bibliography .....	353

## INDICES

I. Index Locorum .....	381
II. Index Nominum .....	415
III. Index Notionum .....	422

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book would never have been written without the support given to me between 2003 and 2011 by the *Centre for Patristic, Medieval and Renaissance Texts* (Project MSM6198959202) at the St Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology, Palacký University in Olomouc (Czech Republic), or without the discussions I had with the *Centre's* collaborators and my colleagues at the Philosophical and Protestant Theological Faculties, Charles University in Prague. The Czech version of my book *Milost a vůle podle Augustina* (Oikumene, Praha 2006) was adapted to some extent for the purposes of the English edition. For her careful translation, my thanks are due to Markéta Janebová from Palacký University in Olomouc; for the valuable comments, which were incorporated into the final text wherever possible, my thanks are due to Brill's anonymous reviewer. I would also like to thank Jiří Klouda from the *Centre for Patristic, Medieval and Renaissance Texts* for the index processing and Simon Gill from Palacký University in Olomouc for the proofreading of the manuscript. Finally I would like to express my gratitude to Jan den Boeft and the editorial board of the Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* for the work they did on the manuscript.



## ABBREVIATIONS OF PERIODICALS AND SERIES

<i>ACO</i>	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i>
<i>AHC</i>	<i>Annuario historiae conciliorum</i>
<i>AugSt</i>	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Bibliothèque Augustinienne, Œuvres de Saint Augustin</i>
<i>BLE</i>	<i>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</i>
<i>CCL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>DR</i>	<i>Downside Review</i>
<i>DSp</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité</i>
<i>FZPhTh</i>	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>HThR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>IThQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LThK</i>	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>NBA</i>	<i>Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana, Opere di Sant' Agostino</i>
<i>N.F.</i>	<i>Neue Folge</i>
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
<i>N.S.</i>	<i>New Series</i>
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>REAug</i>	<i>Revue des études augustinienes</i>
<i>RechAug</i>	<i>Recherches augustinienes</i>
<i>RechSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Revue de philologie de littérature et d'histoire anciennes</i>
<i>RSPhTh</i>	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RThAM</i>	<i>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</i>
<i>SE</i>	<i>Sacris erudiri</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i>
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia patristica</i>
<i>ThQ</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i>
<i>VCh</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>ZPhF</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>



## INTRODUCTION

Augustine's doctrine on grace, which is the subject of this work, is one of the most widely discussed themes to have engaged this versatile author. For Augustine himself, this was a key topic, one he regarded as the very core of Christianity.

Apart from the apostle Paul, one would be hard-pressed to find an early Christian author who was concerned with the issue of grace as seriously and systematically as Augustine. It was in his interpretation that the Pauline doctrine on grace entered the thinking of the Christian West as an essential part of it; we might even say that the relationship between the grace of God and human freedom—the only extensive theological issue of the old church to have originated in the West—dominated the majority of Western theological disputes until the modern era. Such a recurrence not only gives much evidence of the self-understanding of Western Christianity (which, on one hand, puts emphasis on human responsibility; while, on the other, it is aware of human limitation and conditionality), but also reveals the contradictory character of Augustine's contribution. Despite being praised by the ecclesiastical tradition as a saint and *doctor gratiae*, most of the proponents of his doctrine on grace, from Gottschalk to the Jansenists, were cast out beyond the limits of Catholic orthodoxy, and it was Luther, an Augustinian, and his concept of grace (among other things) that brought about the biggest split in Western Christianity.

This book traces the gradual crystallisation of this teaching in the individual periods of Augustine's thinking, from his early philosophical dialogues, the first theological works and the expositions of Pauline letters (Part One) to his answer to Simplicianus, including Augustine's newly formulated doctrine on grace, which was also presented in his *Confessions* and perhaps also implied in his polemic against the Donatists (Part Two). The doctrine was elaborated in greatest detail in the last two decades of Augustine's life in his polemic against the Pelagians (Part Three). The exposition is diachronic, one which Augustine himself recommended to his readers, when, at the end of his life, he critically examined his own work: "one who reads my works in the order in which they were written will find out how I progressed while writing."<sup>1</sup> The focus is thus on the works

---

<sup>1</sup> *Retract.*, prol. 3: CCL 57, 6 f. English translation M. Inez Bogan, 5.



recommended by Augustine; his sermons and correspondence will only be referred to selectively.

Augustine's concept of grace, as we will see from the very beginning, is closely related to his reflection on the will; perhaps it was his concept of the will which determined his doctrine on grace in a crucial way. That is why special attention will also be paid to this theme, in which Augustine—presumably influenced by the theology of the apostle Paul—departed so distinctly from the ancient models of his youth.

The position adopted by Augustine in his youth (as presented in the first part of this book), in contrast to the Manichaeans, puts emphasis on the human will as the source of both evil and the beatific perfection of rational beings, on faith-will as a relevant human “merit” which decides the eternal destiny of human beings. On the other hand, Augustine's teaching directed against the Pelagians (discussed in the third part of this book) posits a will enslaved by both inherited and individual sins, which can be turned towards the good only through the “sweetness” of affective grace, and, as such, cannot have any “merits” on its own. The difference between these positions, both theological and philosophical, is obvious. How did the reader of Cicero and “the books of the Platonists” reach the idea that appears in the polemic against Julian (and which reminds one of Nietzsche and Freud rather than the Stoics or Plotinus)? That was the point of departure of my book. It surely cannot be expected that there is a definite answer to the question; rather, my aim was to follow the development. This is not an easy task, either.

The answer to Simplicianus, in which Augustine formulated his new doctrine on grace for the first time (the dating fluctuates between 395 and 397), is separated from the outbreak of the anti-Pelagian controversy (411) by fifteen years (the focus of the middle part of my book). Beyond doubt, the answer to Simplicianus represented an important transition point in his concept of grace and the will, as Augustine himself admits.<sup>2</sup> The evaluation of this transition varies according to the perspectives of the interpreters: from a shift in emphasis within a continuous development<sup>3</sup> to an utter

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Retract.* II,1,1: CCL 57, 89f. (quoted below, chap. III.2.8, n. 350); *De praed. sanct.* 3,7: BA 24, 478; *De praed. sanct.* 4,8: BA 24, 488. See below, chap. II.1.2.

<sup>3</sup> See C. Harrison, *Rethinking Augustine's Early Theology: An Argument for Continuity*, Oxford 2006; J. Lössl, “Intellektualistischer Voluntarismus—Der Willensbegriff Augustins von Hippo”, in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 301–330.

break point or even a “catastrophe”<sup>4</sup> of Augustine’s previous thinking.<sup>5</sup> From my point of view, there is a discontinuity which, however, does not rule out certain elements of continuity (both of which I will aim to show). What I regard as puzzling are the following two circumstances: when reading Augustine’s works following the answer to Simplicianus, with the exception of his *Confessions*— which illustrate this teaching in a very successful way—one can find its traces only rarely, and its further elaboration even more exceptionally. The tracing of the development is made even more difficult by the fact that the datation of the works in which the elaboration does appear (for example, *De Genesi ad litteram*, *Adnotationes in Iob*, *De virginitate*, *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*, *De Trinitate*) is very often uncertain and their later redaction cannot be ruled out. All the consequences of the doctrine on grace as it appears in the answer to Simplicianus, including those which I regard as unacceptable (such as double predestination, inherited guilt which deserves eternal punishment and its transmission through libidinous procreation), were fully developed later, in the anti-Pelagian polemic. At the same time, the question arises as to what was the role of the polemic against the Donatists, which immediately preceded the anti-Pelagian treatises, in the development of Augustine’s doctrine on grace and the will. Perhaps it was in this dispute, in which Augustine eventually decided to advocate violence as a means of acting upon the will, that the doctrine on grace as independent of human merits and the will as conditioned by other factors than itself (namely, by grace) found extensive use?<sup>6</sup> Or, the other way round, was it this dispute which contributed substantially to the development of Augustine’s doctrine on grace as unconditioned by any human merits?<sup>7</sup> Or could even both of these be true? Or perhaps there is no connection at all between the polemic against the Donatists and the

---

<sup>4</sup> See K. Flasch, *Logik des Schreckens. Augustinus von Hippo, De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum I,2*, Mainz 1995<sup>2</sup>; G. Lettieri, *L’altro Agostino. Ermeneutica e retorica della grazia dalla crisi alla metamorfosi del De doctrina christiana*, Brescia 2001. A. von Harnack was probably the first to discuss the development in Augustine’s thinking from philosophical issues to ecclesiastical theology; see A. von Harnack, *Augustins Konfessionen*, in: idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, I, Gießen 1906<sup>2</sup>, 49–79, esp. 63. A vivid picture of Augustine’s personal and intellectual development is given in P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography (A New Edition with an Epilogue)*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 2000 (London 1967<sup>1</sup>), 147–156.

<sup>5</sup> See also the discussion below, chap. II.1, conclusion.

<sup>6</sup> See K. Flasch, *Logik*.

<sup>7</sup> See J.P. Burns, *Development of Augustine’s Doctrine of Operative Grace*, Paris 1980; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Paris 1996, 129–158.

doctrine on grace?<sup>8</sup> In my opinion, the third option is the most probable one, as I will try to demonstrate in the chapter dealing with the will acted upon through coercion:<sup>9</sup> in other words, Augustine's teaching on the suggestibility of the will through violence may have been partially inspired by his concept of grace as affecting the will in the way it was elaborated in his answer to Simplicianus; at the same time, however, his notion of the suggestibility of the will could have contributed to the development of his doctrine on grace in the anti-Pelagian controversy.

Given the fact that the aim of this book is to follow the development of Augustine's thinking, the presentation of the ideas of Augustine's Pelagian opponents is limited to their image as created by Augustine himself in his rich quotations (which are also a source for the reconstruction of a substantial part of their works). This does not mean, however, that I share Augustine's opinion of them. As the reader will surely notice, these theologians, who develop both the tradition of early Christian thinking and the ancient heritage, have my sympathy in many respects; I even regard their thinking as a logical complement to that of Augustine. It is quite surprising that in a large amount of Augustinian literature, these condemned opponents of Augustine, Julian of Eclanum in particular, are only rarely put in the place which, I think, they deserve, namely that of a justifiable revision of Augustine's theology, which does call for revision.<sup>10</sup> Both Augustine and Julian, in my opinion, have their share of truth—truth which cannot be captured completely by any mortal being. It is perhaps in their polemic that they reveal more of it than either of them in his one-sidedness.

I do realise that both the topic and the manner of my investigation will reveal the most problematic if not dreadful aspects of Augustine's work. I am convinced, however, that without them the popular, torn man and beloved saint would not be who he was, namely a man at the turn of the ancient and medieval ages whose story and thinking ushered in the spiritual heights and dark profundities of the European man.

---

<sup>8</sup> This is probably maintained by J. Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae. Die Erkenntnistheorie und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre Augustins von Hippo*, Leiden—New York—Köln 1997, who pays almost no attention to the polemic against the Donatists (apart from sacramentology, 105–119).

<sup>9</sup> See below, chap. II.4.4–5.

<sup>10</sup> Probably the most radical rejection of the Pelagian criticism of Augustine comes from A. Trapè, an outstanding expert on Augustine; see A. Trapè, "Verso una riabilitazione del pelagianesimo?", in: *Augustinianum*, 3, 1963, 482–516.

PART ONE

“NOTHING ELSE DO I HAVE BUT WILL”  
(386–395)



## CHAPTER ONE

### GOD AS THE GUARANTOR OF THE WORLD ORDER AND THE GIVER OF KNOWLEDGE (PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUES FROM CASSICIACUM IN 386)

Augustine's career as a writer begins with his early, now lost work *De pulchro et apto* (On the Beautiful and the Fitting) in the Ciceronian vein. Judging from his own account,<sup>1</sup> there is no reason to presume that it is concerned with the issue of grace at all. The attention of the young rhetorician was then focused on the philosophical issues which the knowledge of Cicero opened up to him; later he was brought to radical doubt by the scepticism of the New Academy,<sup>2</sup> and it was only after that the reading of the "books of the Platonists"<sup>3</sup> initiated his ascent to purely spiritual, immutable reality.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Confess.* IV,13,20–15,27: CCL 27, 50–54. On this work and its Ciceronian inspiration, see M. Testard, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, Paris 1958, I, 49–66; J.-M. Fontanier, "Sur le traité d'Augustin *De pulchro et apto*: convenance, beauté et adaptation", in: *RSPTh* 73, 1989, 413–421.

<sup>2</sup> On Augustine's scepticism, see P. Alfarić, *L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin I. Du manichéisme au néoplatonisme*, Paris 1918, 259–278, 321–358. This position is presented in Augustine's earliest dialogue *Contra Acad.* II,23: CCL 29, 30. The question of Augustine's sceptical period as a phase in his spiritual development is a matter of dispute; however, it can be argued with certainty that Augustine's business in his first works was to refute this position. The current state of research is presented in J. Doignon, "Etat des questions relatives aux premiers Dialogues de saint Augustin", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989, 59 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,2,3: CCL 27, 114. Cf. also Augustine's description of his spiritual journey in *De beata vita: Lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris* (*De beata vita* 1,4: BA 4/1, 58, where modern editors prefer the reading *Plotini* to *Platonis*, the latter being attested to in manuscripts as well). Whether the works were written by Plotinus, Porphyry, or both of these authors is the subject of long discussions summarised e.g. in P.F. Beatrice ("Quosdam platoniorum libros. The Platonic Readings of Augustine in Milan", in: *VCh* 43, 1989, 248–281), who supports the assumption of W. Theiler, in whose opinion all knowledge of "Neoplatonists" (including quotations from Plotinus) was mediated to Augustine by his reading of Porphyry (see W. Theiler, "Porphyrios und Augustin", in: idem, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 160–248; cf. also the criticism of P. Courcelle, who presupposes Augustine's reading of both authors; see *Les Confessions de saint Augustin dans sa tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité*, Paris 1963, 27–42). From his own account of the Platonists, Augustine regarded Porphyry as the greatest ancient philosopher, who unfortunately never freed himself from the pagan inclination to superstitiousness and magic (see *De civ. Dei* X; see also below, III.2.9, n. 356), while he respected Plotinus as an authority in the matters of the ascent from the sensible to spiritual reality (see e.g. *De civ. Dei* IX,17: CCL 47, 265 f.; *De civ. Dei* X,14: CCL 47, 288; *De civ. Dei* X,16:

Thus in the setting of the Milanese Platonists and Neoplatonising sermons of Bishop Ambrose,<sup>4</sup> Christian conversion was prepared for this restless mind<sup>5</sup> that initially, still on his African home ground, had identified with Manichaeism and then inclined towards a form of Stoicism.<sup>6</sup> Augustine found God as the only principle of all that is, one which does transcend this world, but is also close to the hearts of men and comes to men in his incarnation.

Similarly, there is nothing to be found concerning the doctrine of grace and only a little concerning grace itself in Augustine's early dialogues, written after his conversion on holiday in Cassiciacum in the summer of 386, which presumably partially capture the discussions Augustine held there with his friends, his mother Monica and his son Adeodatus.<sup>7</sup> Still, I would

---

CCL 47, 289). Whatever writings the "books of the Platonists" included, it was probably the spiritual ascent to the incorporeal Godhead associated with Plotinus which drew Augustine's attention.

<sup>4</sup> On the Plotinian "circle" of Milan, see A. Solignac, "Le cercle milanais" (note complémentaire 1), in: *BA* 14, 529–536 (Solignac particularly mentions Ambrose; Simplicianus, who was influenced by his prior friendship with Marius Victorinus; Flavius Mallius Theodorus, the author of several philosophical handbooks; and also several addressees of Augustine's early works); cf. the aforementioned P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions*, 31. G. Madec is rather disinclined to accept this notion, preferring the idea of Augustine's liaison with the people in question to the hypothesis of a Neoplatonist community in Milan; he also points out Christian reservations concerning Neoplatonism with both Ambrose and Augustine (see G. Madec, "Le milieu milanais. Philosophie et christianisme", in: *BLE* 88, 3–4, 1987, 194–205). The impact that Ambrose's allegorical biblical interpretations based on the Neoplatonising notions of God and the soul as spiritual entities had on the young Augustine is described in P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin*, Paris 1968<sup>2</sup>, 93–138, 311–382; but cf. also G. Madec, *Saint Ambroise et la philosophie*, Paris 1974, 61–71.

<sup>5</sup> Augustine's spiritual development until his conversion in 386 was depicted by P. Alfarcic as a journey from Manichaeism and scepticism to Neoplatonism, but not yet Christianity: "Both morally and intellectually, he [Augustine in 386] turned to Neoplatonism rather than the Gospel" (P. Alfarcic, *L'évolution intellectuelle*, 399). The reception, or the gradual mitigation, of this provocative statement by other scholars is summarised in G. Madec, *Le néoplatonisme dans la conversion d'Augustin. Etat d'une question centenaire (depuis Harnack et Boissier, 1888)*, in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium*, 9–25. Regarding Augustine's life, see the biographies by P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*; G. Bonner, *Saint Augustine of Hippo. Life and Controversies*, London 1963; S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999; and J.J. O'Donnell, *Augustine, Sinner & Saint. A New Biography*, London 2005.

<sup>6</sup> See *Confess.* V,3,3: CCL 27, 58; *Confess.* VII,1,1–2: CCL 27, 92f.; *Confess.* VII,5,7: CCL 27, 96; *Confess.* VII,14,20: CCL 27, 106. In these passages from the seventh book of the *Confessions*, Augustine indicates that between his dualistic Manichaean position and the turning towards the incorporeal God there was a stage in which he assumed that God was corporeal and all-embracing in the Stoic sense (cf. Ch. Baguette, "Une période stoïcienne dans l'évolution de la pensée de saint Augustin", in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 47–77).

<sup>7</sup> On the partial historicity of these discussions, which, however, also include a number of fictitious circumstances and are thus Augustine's work (not a collective one) in the manner of

like to bring to the fore three themes related to the subject of this study which are typical of the early stage of Augustine's thought and which will, when Augustine's conception of grace has been crystallised, become either prominent or radically modified. They include (1) the notion of happiness as *deum habere* from the treatise *De beata vita*; (2) the emphasis on the perfect world order, in which evil is included as well and in which every human being is given their due, from the treatise *De ordine*; and (3) the notion of God as the giver of knowledge, as addressed in Augustine's *Soliloquia*.

### 1.1. *Happiness As Deum habere (De beata vita)*

In Augustine's opinion, happy (*beatus*) is he who has what he wants, provided he wants what is truly good.<sup>8</sup> But as transitory things may leave man on their own account, against his will, and he cannot have them whenever he wants, real happiness consists in "possessing God" (*Deum habere*), who abides.<sup>9</sup> Does "possessing God" mean the same thing as seeking him? Do in fact all human beings "possess God", who regards them with favour or disfavour (*propitius, infestus*) in accordance with the way they live?<sup>10</sup> Augustine deals with these questions along the lines of his (newly found) anti-sceptical attitude: there is no middle position between happiness and misery.<sup>11</sup> Human beings are either happy because they do not lack anything, having the proper measure (*modum*) of everything (i.e., wisdom identical

---

ancient models, see J.J. O'Meara, "The Historicity of the Early Dialogues of Saint Augustine", in: *VCh* 5, 1951, 150–178.

<sup>8</sup> See *De beata vita* 2,10: CCL 29, 70f. Here Augustine refers to Cicero's *Hortensius* (frag. 69II/70II, the same quotation in frag. 69I/70I and 70III: Straume-Zimmermann 72–74; 70; 78). On Augustine's reading of this lost dialogue, see M. Testard, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, I, 11–39. Regarding Augustine's conception of happiness, which in many respects follows ancient models, particularly the Neoplatonic ones, see W. Beierwaltes, *Regio Beatitudinis. Zu Augustins Begriff des glücklichen Lebens*, Heidelberg 1981 (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1981, 6).

<sup>9</sup> See *De beata vita* 2,11: CCL 29, 71f. On the ancient background of the notion of happiness as *deum habere*, see J. Doignon, *Etat des questions*, 63f., and the literature listed there. As J.P. Burns points out, this "beatitude through spiritual autonomy" is based on two assumptions: first, the human spirit is able to free itself from corporeal attachments; second, divine truth allows itself to be found by everyone who seeks it (J.P. Burns, *Development*, 19). As we will see, both of these assumptions require thorough analysis.

<sup>10</sup> See *De beata vita* 3,19–21: CCL 29, 75–77.

<sup>11</sup> *De beata vita* 4,24: CCL 29, 78,21f.: ... *nihil esse medium inter miserum et beatum*. The question of whether happiness consists in the search itself was already dealt with in Augustine's earliest extant work *Contra Academicos* I,2,5: CCL 29, 6f. *et passim*. Cf. J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 26–35; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Tübingen 1999, 37.



with Christ), or they are miserable because they lack such wisdom. “Possessing God” thus means coming through the truth (Christ) to God (*summus modus*), who is not subject to any other measure, but gives measure to everything, and enjoying Him for his own sake (*Deo perfrui*):<sup>12</sup>

Whoever, therefore, has arrived at the Supreme Measure through truth is happy. For souls, this is to possess God, that is, to enjoy God. For although other things are possessed by God, they do not themselves possess God.<sup>13</sup>

Happiness therefore does not mean seeking, but finding and fullness (*plena satietas*); i.e., the knowledge of the truth that leads to God.<sup>14</sup>

### 1.2. Perfect Order (De ordine)

God as *summus modus*<sup>15</sup> is the source of the measure of all things,<sup>16</sup> creating thus the world order (*ordo*)<sup>17</sup> into which everything that is happening fits, including error and evil.<sup>18</sup> Just as incorrect expressions set off the beauty of speech and erroneous assertions take part in the disputation,<sup>19</sup> so do evil things contribute to the perfection of all that is:

---

<sup>12</sup> See *De beata vita* 4,33–34: CCL 29, 83f. On Augustine’s re-interpretation of the Ciceronian notion of wisdom as “the measure of the soul”, see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 49f.

<sup>13</sup> *Quisquis igitur ad summum modum per veritatem venerit, beatus est. Hoc est animis Deum habere, id est Deo perfrui. Cetera enim quamvis a Deo habeantur, non habent Deum* (*De beata vita* 4,34: CCL 29, 84). English translation by R. Allison Brown, 113.

<sup>14</sup> See *De beata vita* 4,35: CCL 29, 84. The theme of finding, not seeking truth as the decisive one in Augustine’s Christian conversion is accentuated by A. von Harnack, *Augustins Konfessionen*, 76. The work *De beata vita* with respect to Augustine’s conception of grace is dealt with in greater detail by V.H. Drecoll (*Die Entstehung*, 27–49), who nevertheless focuses particularly on Augustine’s record of his own spiritual journey in this work and also points out the pair *summus modus*—*veritas* depicting the divine persons of the Father and Son. As he concludes, in this work it is not only human knowledge and ethical efforts which lead to the happy life, but the role of God as *summus modus* determining all things is acknowledged in it as well (49). God’s help in the achievement of the happy life is also emphasised in the interpretation of *De beata vita* by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 49f.

<sup>15</sup> *De ord.* II,5,14: CCL 29, 115,13.

<sup>16</sup> *De ord.* I,8,26: CCL 29, 102,114: *rerum modus*.

<sup>17</sup> See *De ord.* I,7,17: CCL 29, 97,10f.; *De ord.* I,10,28: CCL 29, 103,13f. Regarding Augustine’s key term “order” both in this writing and the whole of his work, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboul, *L’ordre caché. La notion d’ordre chez saint Augustin*, Paris 2004.

<sup>18</sup> *Quod enim erit ordini contrarium, necesse erit esse praeter ordinem; nihil autem esse praeter ordinem video: nihil igitur ordini oportet putare esse contrarium. ... nam neminem video errare sine causa; causarum autem series ordine includitur et error ipse non solum gignitur causa sed etiam gignit aliquid, cui e causa fit. Quam ob rem quo extra ordinem non est, eo non potest ordini esse contrarius* (*De ord.* I,6,15: CCL 29, 96f.).

<sup>19</sup> See *De ord.* II,4–5,13: CCL 29, 114f.

What more hideous than a hangman? What more cruel and ferocious than his character? Yet he holds a necessary post in the very midst of laws, and he is incorporated into the order of a well-regulated state; himself criminal in character, he is nevertheless, by others' arrangement, the penalty of evildoers. What can be mentioned more sordid, more bereft of decency, or more full of turpitude than prostitutes, procurers, and the other pest of that sort? Remove prostitutes from human affairs, and you will unsettle everything because of lusts; place them in the position of matrons, and you will dishonour these latter by disgrace and ignominy. ... What more agreeable to us—as quite an appropriate sight for field and farmyard—than the contest and conflict of the barnyard cock ...? But, what have we ever seen more abject than the deformity of the vanquished one? And yet, by that very deformity was the more perfect beauty of the contest in evidence.<sup>20</sup>

This does not mean that God causes evil intentionally; on the contrary, he hates it. But still, evil seems to be necessary in his order:

And does this order of things seem to you unimportant: that God loves things good and does not love things evil? And thus evils, which God does not love, are not apart from order, and nevertheless He does love order itself. This very thing He loves: to love good things, and not to love evil things—and this itself is a thing of magnificent order and of divine arrangement. And because this orderly arrangement maintains the harmony of the universe by this very contrast, it comes about that evil things must need be.<sup>21</sup>

God thus incorporates evil into his order,<sup>22</sup> at the same time carefully distinguishing between good and evil and remunerating everyone with what they deserve.<sup>23</sup> This poses the question of whether God acts in accordance with the world order, being thus subjected to it.<sup>24</sup> Although Augustine does

---

<sup>20</sup> *Quid enim carnifice tetrius? quid illo animo truculentius atque dirius? At inter ipsas leges locum necessarium tenet et in bene moderatae civitatis ordinem inseritur estque suo animo nocens, ordine autem alieno poena nocentium. Quid sordidius, quid inanius decoris [varia lectio] et turpitudinis plenius meretricibus lenonibus ceterisque hoc genus pestibus dici potest? Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus; constitue matronarum loco, labe ac dedecore dehonestaveris. ... Quid nobis suavius, quod agro villaeque spectaculum congruentius ... pugna ... conflictuque gallinaciorum gallorum ...? Quid abiectius tamen deformitate subiecti vidimus? Et per ipsam tamen eiusdem certaminis perfectior pulchritudo provenerat (De ord. II,4,12: CCL 29, 114). English translation after R.P. Russell, 287 f.*

<sup>21</sup> *An parvus rerum ordo tibi videtur, ut et bona Deus diligit et non diligit mala? Ita nec praeter ordinem sunt mala, quae non diligit Deus, et ipsum tamen ordinem diligit; hoc ipsum enim diligit, diligere bona et non diligere mala, quod est magni ordinis et divinae dispositionis. Qui ordo atque dispositio quia universitatis congruentiam ipsa distinctione custodit, fit, ut mala etiam esse necesse sit (De ord. I,7,18: CCL 29, 98). English translation after R.P. Russell, 256.*

<sup>22</sup> See De ord. II,7,23: CCL 29, 119 f.

<sup>23</sup> See De ord. I,7,19: CCL 29, 98; De ord. II,7,22: CCL 29, 118 f.

<sup>24</sup> See De ord. I,10,29: CCL 29, 103; De ord. II,1,2: CCL 29, 107.

not give an unequivocal answer, the whole of the dialogue suggests that the unknown God (*qui scitur melius nesciendo*)<sup>25</sup> as the “supreme measure” is rather the source of the order and law (*lex*)<sup>26</sup> of the world, which are present in things as “numerical” structures (*numeri*), intelligible to the human mind.<sup>27</sup> The beatitude of man (*Deum habere*) then means “being with God” (*cum Deo esse*),<sup>28</sup> i.e., “understanding him” (*Deum intellegere*)<sup>29</sup> as the source of both the “numerical” order of all that is and one’s mind.<sup>30</sup>

### 1.3. *God As the Giver of Knowledge* (Soliloquia)

It is therefore understanding (*intelligentia*) which gives happiness to man; yet at its beginning stands the impulse of the human will: a human being “wishes” to be in order to live, to understand and thus to be happy.<sup>31</sup> However, such beatific understanding—in *Soliloquies* it is the understanding of the truth which lasts independently of individual true things<sup>32</sup> and which is God himself<sup>33</sup>—can only be found with God’s help.<sup>34</sup> Men themselves have only the will (*nihil aliud habeo quam voluntatem*); faith (*fides*), virtue (*virtus*) and knowledge (*scientia*) they must ask for:

Order, I beg Thee, and command what Thou wilt, but heal and open my ears, so that with them I may hear Thy words. Heal and open my eyes so that with them I may perceive Thy wishes. Banish from me my senselessness, so that I may know Thee. ... I realise I must return to Thee. Let Thy door be open to my knocking. Teach me how to come to Thee. Nothing else do I have but will (*voluntas*). Naught else do I know save that fleeting and perishable things are to be spurned, certain and eternal things to be sought after. This I do, O Father, because this is all I know, but how I am to reach Thee I know not. Do

<sup>25</sup> *De ord.* II,16,44: CCL 29, 131,15 f. On the Porphyrian inspiration (see Porphyry, *Sent.* 25: Lamberz 15) of this formulation from the field of negative theology, see W. Theiler, “Porphyrios und Augustin”, 173 n. 29; A. Solignac, “Réminiscences plotiniennes et porphyriennes dans le début du *De ordine* de saint Augustin”, in: *Archives de philosophie*, 20, 1957, 461 n. 27.

<sup>26</sup> See *De ord.* II,8,25: CCL 29, 121.

<sup>27</sup> See *De ord.* II,15,43–16,44: CCL 29, 130 f.

<sup>28</sup> See *De ord.* II,7,20: CCL 29, 118.

<sup>29</sup> See *De ord.* II,2,4: CCL 29, 108.

<sup>30</sup> See *De ord.* II,18,47–II,19,51: CCL 29, 132–135.

<sup>31</sup> See *Solil.* II,1,1: CSEL 89, 47.

<sup>32</sup> See *Solil.* I,15,28: CSEL 89, 42.

<sup>33</sup> See *Solil.* I,1,3: CSEL 89, 5.

<sup>34</sup> K. Janssen maintains that in *Soliloquies* (cf. e.g. *Solil.* I,1,5: CSEL 89, 10), God has a twofold initiative: he both heals the inner eye of the soul and illuminates it (K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Rostock 1936, 50). Knowledge as God’s gift in *Soliloquies* and its role in Augustine’s conception of grace is also accentuated by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 53–58.

Thou inspire me, show me, give me what I need for my journey. If it is by faith that they find Thee who have recourse to Thee, give me faith; if it is through virtue, give me virtue; if it is by knowledge, give knowledge to me. Grant me increase of faith, of hope, and of charity.<sup>35</sup>

The right prayer is God's gift as well;<sup>36</sup> even the seeking itself is inspired by God,<sup>37</sup> just as everything that is in our power we can do thanks to God. Our faith is also enabled by him: *Credamus sane, si vel hoc in potestate <nostra> est.—Potestas nostra ipse est.*<sup>38</sup> Let then God command what he wills (*iube ... quicquid vis*).<sup>39</sup>

It would be a gross mistake, however, to assume that God does not take human merits into consideration. In his *Soliloquies*, Augustine turns towards God, "through whom we denounce the error of those who think that the merits of souls are naught before Thee."<sup>40</sup> In accordance with his eternal laws, by which all transitory things abide, the soul deserves reward or punishment on the basis of the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*): "O God, by whose laws the choice of the soul is free, and rewards to the good and chastisements to the wicked are distributed by necessities settled throughout everything."<sup>41</sup>

\*\*\*

In the early Cassiciacum dialogues Augustine already holds that although human beatitude (consisting in the understanding of God as the eternal truth and supreme measure of all things) originates from the human will,

---

<sup>35</sup> *Iube, quaeso, atque impera quicquid vis, sed sana et aperi aures meas, quibus voces tuas audiam. Sana et aperi oculos meos, quibus nutus tuos videam. Expelle a me insaniam, ut recognoscam te. ... Ad te mihi redeundum esse sentio: pateat mihi pulsanti ianua tua; quomodo ad te perveniatur, doce me. Nihil aliud habeo quam voluntatem, nihil aliud scio nisi fluxa et caduca spernenda esse, certa et aeterna requirenda. Hoc facio, pater, quia hoc solum novi; sed unde ad te perveniatur, ignoro. Tu mihi suggere, tu ostende, tu viaticum praebe. Si fide te inveniunt qui ad te refugium, fidem da, si virtute, virtutem, si scientia, scientiam. Auge in me fidem, auge spem, auge caritatem (Solil. I,1,5: CSEL 89, 9f.).* English translation after T.F. Gilligan, 349.

<sup>36</sup> See Solil. I,1,2: CSEL 89, 4.

<sup>37</sup> ... quem nemo quaerit nisi admonitus (Solil. I,1,3: CSEL 89, 6).

<sup>38</sup> Solil. II,1,1: CSEL 89, 45.

<sup>39</sup> Solil. I,1,5: CSEL 89, 9. On the expression *iube quod vis* (in various modifications), later extended by *da quod iubes*, which played an important role in the Pelagian controversy, see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 56 incl. n. 73; below, chap. II.2.4; III.1, introduction incl. n. 4.

<sup>40</sup> *Deus, per quem improbamur eorum errorem, qui animarum merita nulla esse apud te putant (Solil. I,1,3: CSEL 89, 7).* English translation by T.F. Gilligan, 347.

<sup>41</sup> ... cuius legibus arbitrium animae liberum est bonisque praemia et malis poenae fixis per omnia necessitatibus distributae sunt (Solil. I,1,4: CSEL 89, 8). English translation after T.F. Gilligan, 348.

it is not an automatic outcome of human efforts, but a reward for the efforts supported by God's help. In this conception, God guarantees the just order (almost as a part of the cosmic order) in which the soul is given what it deserves in accordance with its merits, but he also supports the human will in its efforts (or perhaps even activates the will in the first place?<sup>42</sup>). Human beings either (with God's help) attain the beatific understanding of the immutable truth, or not: *tertium non datur*, just as something is either true, or false. Augustine's early image of God is thus ambiguous to a certain extent: on one hand, God is a personal will intervening in the course of human efforts to attain the beatitude of understanding; on the other hand, God is regarded as the guarantor and source of the world order, and the understanding of God-Truth resembles the understanding of mathematical truths (including their bipolar true–false nature).<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> *Solil.* I,1,3: CSEL 89, 6 (quoted above, chap. I.3.3, n. 37). Great importance is attached to *admonitio* by A. Niebergall, who nevertheless unmasks Augustine's early notion of the co-operation of God and man (*admonitio dei*—human reply) as “synergistic”; see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung der Gnade. Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung vor dem Pelagianischen Streit (bis zum Abschluß der Confessiones)*, Göttingen 1951, 26–33.

<sup>43</sup> This ambiguity is rightly pointed out by K. Janssen, who perceives it as a stage in Augustine's gradual abandonment of “Neoplatonism” for the biblical notion of a personal God (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 55–58).

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE UNIVERSE OF WILL (WORKS BEFORE AUGUSTINE'S ORDINATION AS PRESBYTER: 387–390)

The key theme of the works Augustine wrote in Italy after his baptism and in Africa before his ordination as presbyter is the polemic against Manichaeism, which Augustine claims to have professed for nine years (although he had always been a mere “hearer” and had never reached the position of “the elect” connected with strict ascetic rules).<sup>1</sup> This polemic lasts until the late period of Augustine’s life and is one of the main sources of his thinking;<sup>2</sup> its accents and methods, however, partially transform. In the early stage before his ordination, Augustine emphasises that evil originates in the will, not in the nature of the body, as the Manichaean dualism maintains. As an African presbyter, in his polemic against the Manichaean rejection of the law, he will later focus on the explication of the law and grace according to the letters of Paul. As bishop of Hippo he will defend the Old Testament against Manichaean mockery, together with Christian biblical hermeneutics, the Christian idea of God (who is immutable), Christ (who came in a real body) and the Holy Spirit-Paraclete (who cannot be identified with Mani).<sup>3</sup> Finally, in his old age, having been

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Confess.* III,11,20: CCL 27, 38; *Confess.* V,6,10: CCL 27,61. On Augustine’s Manichaeism, see P. Alfarić, *L’évolution intellectuelle*, 65–93, 215–225; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l’Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 27–38. Augustine’s familiarity with Manichaean writings in this early period cannot be attested precisely, but his later reading upon which he drew in his polemics cannot be dated to this period (cf. J.K. Coyle, “What Did Augustine Know about Manichaeism when He Wrote His Two Treatises *De moribus*?”, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst, eds., *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 43–56). On Manichaean teachings, see P. Alfarić, *L’évolution intellectuelle*, 95–213; F. Decret, *Aspects*, 183–322. Basic facts about Manichaean theology and organisational structure can be found e.g. in H.-Ch. Puech, “Le manichéisme”, in: *Histoire des religions*, II, ed. idem, Paris 1972, 523–645; M. Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, Paris 1981; A. Böhlting, s. v. “Manichäismus”, in: *TRE* 22, Berlin—New York 1991, 25–45.

<sup>2</sup> On Augustine’s criticism of Manichaean teachings and morals, see P. Alfarić, *L’évolution intellectuelle*, 278–320.

<sup>3</sup> Manichaeans identified Mani with the Paraclete, whom Jesus promised to send (cf. John 14–16), but not with the Holy Spirit (see F. Decret, “Objectif premier visé par Augustin dans ses controverses orales avec les responsables manichéens d’Hippone”, in: J. van Oort—

accused of Manichaeism by Pelagians because of his doctrine of original sin, he will seek to show how both extremes—Manichaeism and Pelagianism—in his interpretation eventually converge.<sup>4</sup>

The topics sketched out here in passing overlap to a certain extent in all the aforementioned periods. Referring to the early period of Augustine's thinking before his ordination, I would like to mention several factors influential in his later doctrine of grace, all of which are, more or less closely, related to his anti-Manichaean polemic. They are as follows: (1) the themes of the image of God in man and its renewal in the treatise *De quantitate animae* (and other works from this period); (2) the conviction that evil originates in human will, not in human nature, from the first book of *De libero arbitrio*; (3) the conception of happiness as love of God mediated by the Holy Spirit from *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*; (4) the analysis of sin from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*; (5) the analysis of the will from the first part of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*; and (6) the first mention of Christianity as the religion of grace from *De vera religione*.

### 2.1. *The Image of God in Man* (*De quantitate animae*)

In Augustine's opinion (aimed polemically against the Manichaeans), the human soul is not identical to God, but was created by him; it is nevertheless similar to God and, from all things created, closest to him.<sup>5</sup> Such an "image and likeness" (*imago et similitudo*)<sup>6</sup> rest in the "inward man", i.e., in

---

O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst, eds., *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 61–64). On Augustine's Christological and pneumatological polemic against the Manichaeans, see also J. Ries, "Jésus Sauveur dans la controverse anti-manichéenne de saint Augustin", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst, eds., *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 185–194.

<sup>4</sup> See below, esp. chap. III.3.2.

<sup>5</sup> See *De quant. an.* 1,2–2,3; CSEL 89, 133; *De quant. an.* 34,77; CSEL 89, 225.

<sup>6</sup> Augustine is familiar with the teaching of the Greek Fathers according to whom only Christ is the real "image and likeness", while man was created "in the image and likeness" (*ad imaginem et similitudinem*) as an image of the image. He also suggests a possible difference between the "image" as the spiritual part of man (*mens, spiritus*) and the "likeness" belonging to the other parts. However, these distinctions, both terminological and factual, are rendered by him rather as the opinion of others. See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 51,4; CCL 44A, 81 f. On Augustine's notion of the image of God in man, its sources and development, see G.A. McCool, "The Ambrosian Origin of St. Augustine's Theology of the Image of God in Man", in: *Theological Studies*, 20, 1959, 62–81; H. Somers, "Image de Dieu. Les sources de l'exégèse augustinienne", in: *REAug* 7, 1961, 105–125; J.E. Sullivan, *The Image of God. The Doctrine of St. Augustine and its Influence*, Dubuque (Iowa) 1963; A. Schindler, *Wort und Analogie in*

reason and intellect (*ratio et intellectus*), distinguishing human beings from animals, over which they have power.<sup>7</sup> The creation of humans “in the image and likeness” means for Augustine that they are directed towards God (*ad ipsum*), by whom they were created.<sup>8</sup> This image of God, the most precious of all that men were given, but also somewhat backgrounded because of their excessive immersion in sensory perception, is to be renewed by men’s “retiring into themselves” and thus to God so that they can become “new men”.<sup>9</sup> This is a difficult task and the human spirit will not succeed unless helped by the one to whom it returns. Only through the kindness of the one whose goodness and power created him (*formatus*) can man be renewed (*reformandus*):

This is an achievement that is utterly impossible unless we remake ourselves in His image, the image He committed to our care as something most precious and dear, when He gave us to ourselves so constituted that nothing can take precedence to us save He Himself. But to my mind this calls for action than which none is more laborious, none that is more akin to inaction, for it is such as the soul cannot begin or complete except with the help of Him to whom it yields itself. Hence it is that man’s reformation is dependent on the mercy of Him to whose goodness and power he owes his formation.<sup>10</sup>

As Augustine maintains at this point, it means that the soul will turn away from the temptations of the sensible world “with the help of God’s justice”, aware of its future separation from the body.<sup>11</sup>

---

*Augustins Trinitätslehre*, Tübingen 1965, 61–74; P. Courcelle, *Recherches*, 96–102; R.A. Markus, “*Imago* and *Similitudo* in Augustine”, in: *REAug* 10, 1964, 125–143. See also below, I.3.2 incl. n. 64, and III.2.5a.

<sup>7</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* I,17,28: CSEL 91, 95 f. However, even the “outward man” (body) is in Augustine’s opinion similar to a certain extent to the good creator on the grounds of his own goodness (being, life and intellect provide things with a scale in proximity to God). See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 51,2: CCL 44A, 79 f.

<sup>8</sup> See *De vera relig.* 44,82: CCL 32, 241 f.

<sup>9</sup> ... *quo admonetur anima, ne se ultra quam necessitas cogit, refundat in sensus, sed ab his potius ad seipsam colligat et repuerescat Deo; quod est novum hominem fieri vetere exuto* (*De quant. an.* 28,55: CSEL 89, 201).

<sup>10</sup> *Quod omnino fieri non potest, nisi ad eius reformemur imaginem, quam nobis ut pretiosissimum quiddam et carissimum custodiendam dedit, dum nos ipsos nobis tales dedit, qualibus nihil possit praeter ipsum anteponi. Hac autem actione nihil mihi videtur operosius et nihil est cessationi similis neque tamen eam suscipere aut implere animus potest nisi eo ipso adiuvante cui redditur. Unde fit ut homo eius clementia reformandus sit, cuius bonitate ac potestate formatus est* (*De quant. an.* 28,55: CSEL 89, 201 f.). English translation by J.M. Colleran, 82.

<sup>11</sup> See *De quant. an.* 32,73: CSEL 89, 221 f.



“The image of God” in human beings has thus a distinctly intellectual character.<sup>12</sup> It is not mentioned whether it also includes the free choice of the will, although Augustine naturally knows that the soul was endowed with this gift (*liberum arbitrium*) as well, on the grounds of which it can be rewarded or punished. What he does say is that it is not meant for disturbing God’s order, but for its realization.<sup>13</sup> The true and only freedom of men (*perfecta et sola libertas*) consists in finding delight in the service to God: “For He frees from all things whom it is most useful for all to serve, and to find delight in whose service is perfect freedom—the only freedom.”<sup>14</sup>

In all their due efforts, men are to be aware that when they act rightly, it is God who acts through them (*cum bene agitur, Deum per nos agere*):

Let us realize, however, that as far as is possible and commanded, we must give assistance to souls of our own kind struggling in error, and realize, too, that when this is done properly, God is acting through us. And let us not arrogate anything to ourselves as our own, deceived by a desire of empty glory, for by this one evil we are plunged from the heights to the depths.<sup>15</sup>

## 2.2. *The Origin of Evil in the Will and Good Will As Happiness* (*De libero arbitrio*)

Although not explicitly belonging to God’s image in man, free will has an essential role in another context, namely in Augustine’s anti-Manichaeic search for the origin of evil.

The dialogue *De libero arbitrio* (with respect to Augustine’s early period before his ordination as presbyter, it is especially the first book which is of

<sup>12</sup> Although we also learn that the image and likeness of God in the human being—created as man and woman—consist in the intellect and action (*actio*). See *De Gen. Manich.* I,25,43: CSEL 91, 113.

<sup>13</sup> See *De quant. an.* 36,80: CSEL 89, 229.

<sup>14</sup> *Nam ille ab omnibus liberat, cui servire omnibus utilissimum est et in cuius servitio placere perfecta et sola libertas est* (*De quant. an.* 34,78: CSEL 89, 227). English translation after J.M. Colleran, 108. Regarding Augustine’s conception of freedom as the opposite of enslavement (not necessity), i.e., the possibility of wanting and doing the good, see M. Huftier, “Libre arbitre, liberté et péché chez saint Augustin”, in: *RThAM* 33, 1966, 187–281.

<sup>15</sup> *Errantibus vero cognatis animis et laborantibus, quantum licet atque praeceptum est, opem ferendam esse sciamus ita, ut hoc ipsum, cum bene agitur, deum per nos agere intellegamus. Neque quicquam nobis proprium vindicemus inanis gloriae cupiditate decepti, quo uno malo a summo in ima demergimur* (*De quant. an.* 34,78: CSEL 89, 227). English translation by J.M. Colleran, 108. The importance of this passage in the development of Augustine’s conception of grace is pointed out by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 70.

interest to us<sup>16</sup>) is based on the Manichaean question: Whence evil, if there is no evil nature? From good God then? According to Augustine, good God cannot be the originator of evil because—as it has already been said—he is the guarantor of the order in which good deserves reward and evil will be punished.<sup>17</sup> However, it would not be just to punish evil if it did not come out of the will (*voluntas*):

... [E]veryone who does wrong is the author of his own wrongdoing. If you are not convinced, remember ... that wrongdoing is punished by God's justice. It would not be punished justly, unless it were done voluntarily.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> As follows from Augustine's own account (*Retract.* I,9,1: CCL 57, 23), he finished the last two books of the manuscript in Africa, when he was already a presbyter. *De libero arbitrio* II–III cannot be therefore dated with certainty before 391, but before 395. This fact is strongly emphasised by V.H. Drecoll (*Die Entstehung*, 81 ff., n. 185), in contrast to the older commentators of Augustine's conception of grace (see e.g. K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 74–81; A. Zeoli, *La teologia agostiniana della Grazia fino alle Quaest. ad Simpl.* (396), Napoli 1963, 17–39). O. du Roy notices a break caused by the time delay before *De lib. arb.* II,16,44, and he finds terminological and factual differences between the two redactions (see O. du Roy, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391*, Paris 1966, 236–256). The specific character of the first book as the evidence of Augustine's early attempt at a Platonising interpretation of Christianity is also accentuated by P. Séjourné ("Les conversions de saint Augustin d'après le *De libero arbitrio*, L. I", in: *RSR* 25, 1951, 243–264 and 333–363); an "experiment with Stoicism", abandoned in the course of the first book in favour of Neoplatonism, is also found here by R.J. O'Connell ("*De libero arbitrio* I: Stoicism revisited", in: *AugSt* 1, 1970, 49–68). On the contrary, G. Madec points out the factual integrity of the whole treatise (see G. Madec, "*Unde malum?* Le livre I du *De libero arbitrio*", in: L.F. Pizzolato, ed., "*De Libero Arbitrio*" di Agostino d'Ippona, Palermo 1990, 19 ff.); similarly C. Harrison, *Rethinking*, 200–224. J. Wetzel (*Augustine and the Limits of Virtue*, Cambridge 1992, 55–85) identifies Augustine's ideal of beatitude as essentially Stoic in the whole of *De libero arbitrio*.

<sup>17</sup> See *De lib. arb.* I,1,1,1: CCL 29, 211. Regarding the term *ordo* (order), which assumes the key position in the dialogue, see B.T. McDonough, "The Notion of Order in St. Augustine's On Free Choice of the Will", in: *IThQ* 46, 1979, 51–55. On the whole of the first book of *De libero arbitrio*, see. F. De Capitani, "Studio introduttivo", in: *Il "De Libero Arbitrio" di S. Agostino. Studio introduttivo, testo, traduzione e commento*, Milano 1987, 93–114; G. Madec, "*Unde malum?*"; briefly also O. du Roy, *L'intelligence*, 239–241.

<sup>18</sup> ... *sed quisque malus sui malefacti auctor est. Vnde si dubitas, illud attende quod ... maleficia iustitia Dei vindicari. Non enim iuste vindicarentur, nisi fierent voluntate* (*De lib. arb.* I,1,1,3: CCL 29, 211). English translation after M. Pontifex, 35 f. On the term *voluntas*, which is often used by Augustine to refer to the "moral self", see J.M. Rist, "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination", in: *JThS*, N.S., 20, 1969, 421 ff. According to N.W. den Bok, Augustine makes a distinction between the will (*voluntas*) as an intentional propensity of a rational being and the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) as a partial consent or dissent to a given opportunity (N.W. den Bok, "Freedom of the Will. A Systematic and Biographical Sounding of Augustine's Thoughts on Human Willing", in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 237–270). However, Augustine does not strictly adhere to this distinction either terminologically or factually. What is of greater importance for the development of his doctrine of grace is the distinction between the will as part of human nature (the ability to make a decision) and

It can be concluded from this elementary assumption that in Augustine's conception evil is solely moral evil, namely sin, or the violation of the law. Yet, is the violation of the law in itself tantamount to the definition of evil? In other words: Is sin evil because it violates the law, or is it forbidden by the law because it is evil? If the latter, does it mean that evil can be defined as doing what we would not like to bear ourselves?<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, what if we sometimes want to bear evil because of perverted concupiscence (*libido*)?<sup>20</sup> Is it not concupiscence itself, i.e., improper or culpable desire (*mala, culpabilis, improbanda cupiditas* or *libido*)<sup>21</sup>, which is the originator of evil? *In omni facto malo libidinem dominari et eo ipso malum esse*, says Augustine.<sup>22</sup> In a way which contradicts reason,<sup>23</sup> such a desire turns to things which can be lost against one's will:

I am very glad that I know clearly now what that blameworthy desire (*culpabilis cupiditas*) is which we call passion (*libido*). I can now see it is love of those things which each of us can lose against his will.<sup>24</sup>

The true cause of evil is therefore when reason (*ratio, mens*) loses control over desires which it is to control according to the eternal law (*lex aeterna*)<sup>25</sup> (for this law requires that "everything should have its due order"<sup>26</sup>). All in all, evil is evil because it violates the (eternal) law.<sup>27</sup>

---

the actual will turned towards good or evil as the realisation of the natural endowment. This distinction is not fixed terminologically either: although *liberum arbitrium* might be used more frequently to refer to the former and *voluntas* to the latter, both terms are very often used interchangeably. Regarding Augustine's terminology related to the will, see also M. Huftier, "Libre arbitre".

<sup>19</sup> See *De lib. arb.* 1,3,6,15–16: CCL 29, 214.

<sup>20</sup> See *De lib. arb.* 1,3,8,20: CCL 29, 215. On Augustine's synonymous terms *libido* (loaned from classical Latin where it generally refers to "desire" and from the Latin translations of the Bible) and *concupiscentia* (appearing solely in the ecclesiastical lexicon), see G. Bonner, "Libido and Concupiscentia in St. Augustine", in: *StPatr* 6 (= *TU* 81), 1962, 303–314; idem, *Saint Augustine of Hippo*, 398–401; M. Verschoren, "The Appearance of the Concept *concupiscentia* in Augustine's Early Antimanichaean Writings (388–391)", in: *Augustiniana*, 52, 2002, 199–240.

<sup>21</sup> See *De lib. arb.* 1,4,10,28: CCL 29, 216; *De lib. arb.* 1,4,10,31: CCL 29, 217.

<sup>22</sup> *De lib. arb.* 1,4,10,27: CCL 29, 216. See also *De lib. arb.* 1,4,10,28: CCL 29, 216.

<sup>23</sup> See *De lib. arb.* 1,8,18,64: CCL 29, 223.

<sup>24</sup> ... *gaudeo tam me plane cognovisse, quid sit etiam illa culpabilis cupiditas, quae libido nominatur. Quam esse iam apparet earum rerum amorem, quas potest quisque invitus amittere* (*De lib. arb.* 1,4,10,31: CCL 29, 217). English translation by M. Pontifex, 43 f.

<sup>25</sup> ... [*mens*], *cui regnum in libidines aeterna lege concessum esse cognoscimus* (*De lib. arb.* 1,10,20,71: CCL 29, 224).

<sup>26</sup> ... *ut omnia sint ordinatissima* (*De lib. arb.* 1,6,15,51: CCL 29, 220). English translation by M. Pontifex, 49.

<sup>27</sup> As K. Janssen points out, although sin is understood here as the violation of cosmic

But how is it that reason loses the control over desires which is inherent to it? Augustine knows quite well that what is stronger cannot be forced to anything by what is weaker. Concupiscence thus cannot enslave the human mind, which is the stronger of the two, and God (as only God is stronger than the human mind) will not enslave it either because it contradicts his justice. The mind thus succumbs to desire solely on account of its own will (*propria voluntas*) and the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*). That is why it deserves a punishment in the form of suffering brought about by the domination of desires:

... [N]othing makes a mind give way to desire (*cupiditas*) except its own will and free choice. ... It follows that you think such a mind justly punished for so great a sin. ... Well, surely that punishment should not be thought a light one, which consists in the mind being ruled by passion (*libido*), being robbed of its store of virtue, being dragged hither and thither, poor and needy, now judging false for true, ... now withholding its assent, and often frightened of clear reasoning, now despairing of finding any truth at all, and clinging closely to the darkness of its folly, now striving for the light of understanding, and again falling back through exhaustion. Meanwhile the passions rage like tyrants, and throw into confusion the whole soul and life of men with storms from every quarter ...<sup>28</sup>

This raises the question of whether every man was originally virtuous and wise, and succumbed only later to the desires, the domination of which he bears now. Or did the souls live wisely just before they entered the body? Does man have a will at all?<sup>29</sup>

At this point, Augustine only answers the last question. Undoubtedly, human beings have a will; they even have a good will, i.e., the will to happiness, to a good life.<sup>30</sup> This will is inalienably theirs, it is entirely within

---

balance, the biblical notion of sin as the violation of the law is beginning to assert itself (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 88 ff.). For sin as the violation of the order in various forms, see also A.-I. Bouton-Touboulie, *L'ordre*, 297–317.

<sup>28</sup> ... *nulla res alia mentem cupiditatis comitem faciat quam propria voluntas et liberum arbitrium. ... Sequitur iam ut tibi videatur iuste illam pro peccato tanto poenas pendere. ... Num ista ipsa poena parva existimanda est, quod ei libido dominatur, expoliataque virtutis opulentia per diversa inopem atque indigentem trahit, nunc falsa pro veris approbantem, ... nunc adensionem suspendentem suam et plerumque perspicuas ratiocinationes formidantem, nunc desperantem de tota inventione veritatis et stultitiae tenebris penitus inhaerentem, nunc conantem in lucem intellegendi rursusque fatigatione decidentem. Cum interea cupiditatum illud regnum tyrannice saeviat et variis contrariisque tempestatibus totum hominis animum vitamque perturbet* (*De lib. arb.* I,11,21,76–I,11,22,78: CCL 29, 225 f.). English translation by M. Pontifex, 57 f.

<sup>29</sup> See *De lib. arb.* I,12,24,80–I,12,25,82: CCL 29, 226 f.

<sup>30</sup> See *De lib. arb.* I,12,25,82–83: CCL 29, 227.

their power, for “what is so fully in the power of the will as the will itself?”<sup>31</sup> The contents of a good will is good will itself because “to love one’s own good will ... is itself good will”.<sup>32</sup> For the attainment of this good, the greatest of all goods,<sup>33</sup> the will itself suffices. Good will on its own is thus the inalienable good which earns human beings happiness:

... [A]ny man with the will to lead a good and upright life, provided he prefers this will to all fleeting goods, will acquire so great a possession with such great ease that to have what he wills is the same thing as to will it. ... When this very joy deriving from the possession of this good uplifts the soul peacefully, quietly, and steadfastly, it is called the happy life.<sup>34</sup>

However, there may be a difference between the will to happiness and a good will (the will to live rightly), for there may live people who desire happiness, but do not want to live rightly (*recte vivere*). It is for such a case that the eternal law defines the relationship between happiness and a good will: happiness (and misery) is given to men according to the merit of the will (*in voluntate meritum*): “For the eternal law ... has settled this with unchangeable firmness ... that merit lies in the will, while reward and punishment lie in happiness and misery.”<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Quid enim tam in voluntate quam ipsa voluntas sita est?* (*De lib. arb.* 1,12,26,86: CCL 29, 228). English translation by M. Pontifex, 61.

<sup>32</sup> ... *nonne bonam suam voluntatem diligere ... etiam ipsa bona voluntas est?* (*De lib. arb.* 1,13,28,95: CCL 29, 230). English translation by M. Pontifex, 64.

<sup>33</sup> See *De lib. arb.* 1,13,27,90: CCL 29, 228 f.

<sup>34</sup> ... *quisquis recte honesteque vult vivere, si id se velle prae fugacibus bonis velit, adsequatur tantam rem tanta facilitate, ut nihil aliud ei quam ipsum velle sit habere quod voluit. ... Atqui hoc ipsum gaudium, quod huius boni adeptione gignitur, cum tranquille et quiete atque constanter erigit animum, beata vita dicitur* (*De lib. arb.* 1,13,29,97–98: CCL 29, 231). English translation by R.P. Russell, 100. Seneca also recognises a “good will”, which is sufficient for moral perfection and is its own goal; cf. A.-J. Voelke, *L’idée de volonté dans le stoïcisme*, Paris 1973, 178–182 and 185. According to G. de Plinval, such an optimistic analysis of the will is evidence of Augustine’s enthusiasm after his baptism, when he has not yet started dealing in depth with human sin; it is a description of “perfect” (entirely unrelativized) freedom, i.e., “freedom reduced to an ideal scheme” (see G. de Plinval, “Aspects du déterminisme et de la liberté dans la doctrine de saint Augustin”, in: *REAug* 1, 1955, 349 and 377). By the same token, F.-J. Thonnard speaks about a “philosophical notion of freedom”, in which the “voluntary” aspect of human actions is regarded *eo ipso* as “free” (see F.-J. Thonnard, “La notion de liberté en philosophie augustinienne”, in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 250–253). However, as R.J. O’Connell points out, Augustine will soon abandon this Stoic “experiment”, in which happiness is identified with good will, in order to guarantee the relationship between good will and happiness by means of the eternal law, which transcends the will (see R.J. O’Connell, “*De libero arbitrio* I”).

<sup>35</sup> *Hoc enim aeterna lex illa ... incommutabili stabilitate firmavit, ut in voluntate meritum sit, in beatitudine autem et miseria praemium atque supplicium* (*De lib. arb.* 1,14,30,101: CCL 29, 231). English translation by M. Pontifex, 66.

A good will embraces the law; an evil one defies it.<sup>36</sup> Thus it holds again that an evil will is one which defies the (eternal) law. In accordance with what we already know, the law must read as follows: A good will deserves a reward, an evil one deserves a punishment; a good will is one which pursues a good life, i.e., the control of reason over desires. Evil then means preferring, with one's own will, desires at the expense of reason, i.e., preferring transitory things to the eternal ones.<sup>37</sup>

### 2.3. *The Love of God Poured Out into Human Hearts*

(De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum)

As early as this stage of his thinking, Augustine's philosophical concept of happiness as the will to goodness undergoes a kind of biblical emendation, which again takes place against the backdrop of the anti-Manichaean polemic. Happy is surely he who has what he loves, provided it really is the chief good.<sup>38</sup> While the chief good of the body is the soul,<sup>39</sup> the chief good of the soul is virtue,<sup>40</sup> which the soul can only reach if it follows after (*sequitur*) something different from itself, namely God, whom it cannot lose.<sup>41</sup> Happiness thus means cleaving (*haerere*) to God by love (*dilectione, amore, caritate*),<sup>42</sup> approaching him, or even reaching him intellectually, being illuminated and occupied by his truth and holiness (not becoming God, as the Manichaeans might maintain).<sup>43</sup> Augustine develops this idea on the

<sup>36</sup> See *De lib. arb.* I,15,31,103–104; *CCL* 29, 232.

<sup>37</sup> See *De lib. arb.* I,16,34,115–I,16,35,116; *CCL* 29, 234f. For that reason, some interpreters regard Augustine's conception of the free choice of the will as "extreme intellectualism" (F. Sontag, "Augustine's Metaphysics and Free Will", in: *HTHR* 60, 1967, 297–306), while others point out that the will in Augustine's conception is always motivated affectively (see F. Berthold, Jr., "Free Will and Theodicy in Augustine: An Exposition and Critique", in: *Religious Studies*, 17, 1981, 526); in our case, presumably by the desire for happiness. Augustine's remarks on the will from the point of view of psychology are analysed by F. Haider, "Augustinus und das psychologische Problem des freien Willens", in: E. Herbrich (ed.), *Der Mensch als Persönlichkeit und Problem. Philosophische Überlegungen und psychologische Erfahrungen (Gedenkschrift für I. Betschart)*, München 1963, 231–255.

<sup>38</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,3,4; *CSEL* 90, 6.

<sup>39</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,5,7; *CSEL* 90, 9.

<sup>40</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,5,8; *CSEL* 90, 11.

<sup>41</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,6,9–10; *CSEL* 90, 12 f.

<sup>42</sup> *Nam quid erit aliud optimum hominis, nisi cui est haerere beatissimum? Id autem solus Deus est, cui haerere certe non valemus nisi dilectione, amore, caritate* (*De mor. eccl.* I,14,24; *CSEL* 90, 29).

<sup>43</sup> *Sed cum sequimur diligendo, consequimur vero, non cum hoc omnino efficitur quod est ipse, sed ei proximi eumque mirifico et intelligibili modo contingentes eiusque veritate et sanctitate penitus illustrati atque comprehensi* (*De mor. eccl.* I,11,18; *CSEL* 90, 21).

ground of the Christian teaching on the Trinity in God: Christ as the truth and wisdom makes it possible to see the Father; love, poured out through the Holy Spirit into human hearts (cf. Rom. 5:5), sanctifies men and enables them to conform to the likeness of God, whose nature the Spirit shares.<sup>44</sup>

It is through love, then, that we are conformed to God, and being so conformed and made like to Him and set apart from the world, we are no longer confounded with those things which should be subject to us. But this is the work of the Holy Spirit. *Hope, he says, does not confound us, because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us* (Rom. 5:5).<sup>45</sup>

It is the fire of love, which the Spirit pours out into the hearts and which represents the love of true virtue,<sup>46</sup> that frees men from the captivity of the body into which men are thrown “for the sin of old” (*propter antiquum peccatum*),<sup>47</sup> i.e., the sin of Adam as our “old man”.<sup>48</sup>

Concupiscence (*cupiditas vel libido*) is thus not in opposition to a life in accordance with reason, but to the love of God, to the embrace of God even (*Dei amplexus*), and to the flame of divine love (*ignis amoris, caritatis ardor, divini amoris incendium*), which purifies and sanctifies and through which the soul “is carried up to God” (*se rapiet in Deum*).<sup>49</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, the safest way to this love is the love of man (*hominis erga hominem caritas*); those who despise the others will come neither to God, nor, consequently, to happiness.<sup>50</sup> Happiness is still regarded here as the reward (*praemium*) for

<sup>44</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,13,22–23: CSEL 90, 26 f.; *De mor. eccl.* I,16,29: CSEL 90, 34. The line in Rom. 5:5, which will gain great importance in his doctrine of grace, Augustine probably uses here for the first time (see A.-M. La Bonnardière, “Le verset paulinien Rom. V,5 dans l’œuvre de saint Augustin”, in: *Augustinus Magister*, Paris 1954, II, 657–665; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 68).

<sup>45</sup> *Fiet ergo per caritatem ut conformemur Deo et ex eo conformati atque figurati et circumcisi ab hoc mundo non confundamur cum his quae nobis debent esse subiecta. Fit autem hoc per spiritum sanctum. Spes enim, inquit, non confundit, quoniam caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis* (*De mor. eccl.* I,13,23: CSEL 90, 27). English translation by D.A. Gallagher and I.J. Gallagher, 21.

<sup>46</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,13,22–23: CSEL 90, 26–28; *De mor. eccl.* I,16,29: CSEL 90, 34; *De mor. eccl.* I,15,25: CSEL 90, 29.

<sup>47</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,22,40: CSEL 90, 45.

<sup>48</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,19,36: CSEL 90, 40.

<sup>49</sup> *De mor. eccl.* I,22,41: CSEL 90, 46; *De mor. eccl.* I,30,64: CSEL 90, 67.

<sup>50</sup> See *De mor. eccl.* I,26,48–51: CSEL 90, 53–55. The prominence of love of neighbour in this treatise is pointed out by K. Janssen, who perceives it as one of the symptoms of Augustine’s transition from Platonic inspirations to biblical faith (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 81–88). On the relationship between love of God and love of neighbour, see R. Canning, *The Unity of Love for God and Neighbour in St. Augustine*, Heverlee–Leuven 1993 (concerning *De mor.*, see esp. 2–8, 37–49); A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L’ordre*, 579–584.

human merits (*merita*): “For eternal life is the whole reward, and its promise fills us with joy. But reward cannot precede merit or be given to a man before he deserves it.”<sup>51</sup> But Augustine makes it clear that it requires “more than mere good will” for its attainment. Instead, it can be attained by means of love endowed by the Spirit, based on rationality and prudence (*ratio atque prudentia*), which are now also referred to as God’s gift: “But here good will alone does not suffice, for it is a work demanding great understanding and prudence, which no one can exercise unless they be given to him by God, the fountain of all good.”<sup>52</sup>

Happiness, we might conclude, as the fruit of love poured out into human hearts through the Spirit, enables men to grow closer in likeness to God, whom we see through Christ, and gives them the merit of virtue.<sup>53</sup> Only in his later works will Augustine call this “outpouring of love” grace.

#### 2.4. *The Crevice in the Universe of Will* (De Genesi contra Manichaeos)

In his anti-Manichaean exegesis of the biblical account of the creation of the world and man (Gen. 1–3),<sup>54</sup> Augustine puts emphasis mainly on the voluntary aspect of God’s creation: God created the world “because he willed” (*quia voluit*); his will has no other cause than itself.<sup>55</sup> God was not compelled by another force to disperse a part of his luminous nature into the hostile darkness (as the Manichaeans might interpret the creation of the world), but he created everything perfectly good on account of his own will, which is free of all necessity (*omnia bona fecit voluntate, nihil mali patitur necessitate*).<sup>56</sup>

<sup>51</sup> *Vita enim aeterna est totum praemium, cuius promissione gaudemus, nec praemium potest praecedere merita priusque homini dari quam dignus est* (De mor. eccl. I,25,47: CSEL 90, 52). English translation after D.A. Gallagher and I.J. Gallagher, 38.

<sup>52</sup> *Non enim ad haec satis est voluntas bona, sed opus est magna quadam ratione atque prudentia, qua nemo uti potest, nisi Deus ille fons omnium bonorum id tribuerit* (De mor. eccl. I,26,51: CSEL 90, 55). English translation by D.A. Gallagher and I.J. Gallagher, 41.

<sup>53</sup> The uniqueness of this thought in the context of Augustine’s early period is enunciated by J.P. Burns, *Development*, 20f.; great attention is also paid to it by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 67–69.

<sup>54</sup> For this work, see the remarks of its last editor: D. Weber, “Augustinus, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Zu Augustins Darstellung und Widerlegung der manichäischen Kritik am biblischen Schöpfungsbericht”, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 228–306.

<sup>55</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* I,2,4: CSEL 91, 71.

<sup>56</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,39,43: CSEL 91, 171f.



The counterpart of God's will, which has no cause but itself, is represented by the human will, which has the same characteristics as enunciated in the first book of *De libero arbitrio*. In the exegesis of the book of Genesis, the analysis is complemented by insights taken over from the narration in Gen. 3.<sup>57</sup> According to Augustine, the protagonists of this story, the snake, the man and the woman, represent three components of a human act: suggestion (*suggestio*), the desire (*cupiditas*) aroused by it and the consent of reason (*ratio*) to be seduced by the desire.<sup>58</sup> It must be noted that the snake (*suggestio*) does not represent a purely external temptation (e.g. the devil), but an improper goal established by humans themselves either in their cognition (*cogitatio*) or in their senses (*sensus*).<sup>59</sup> Essential to the seduction of reason is human will, without which neither sin nor any evil can arise (even the devil is the devil by his will, not by nature).<sup>60</sup>

Here again, the sin consists in the victory of desire over reason, though not in terms of the priority of the transitory over the eternal or of the sensible over the spiritual, but in terms of pride (*superbia*), desire for something that does not belong to man (to be like God; Gen. 3:5),<sup>61</sup> and the aim to blame one's own guilt on God ("the woman whom You gave to be with me", she seduced me; Gen. 3:12) and to get rid of God as Lord (*voluntas liber esse a eius dominio*).<sup>62</sup> In this way, humans violate the law which was imposed on them (*lex*), and betray their middle position (*medietas*) between God, to whom they are to be subordinated, and the rest of creation, which is to be subject to humans.<sup>63</sup> The violated order retaliates by losing its force: animals are not subordinated to humans any more; some even harm them.<sup>64</sup> Men

---

<sup>57</sup> Augustine's teaching on creation, which leaves room for human self-completion through turning towards God, is regarded by M.-A. Vannier as a polemic against the Manichaean "emanationism" (see M.-A. Vannier, "L'interprétation augustinienne de la création et l'émanatisme manichéen", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst, eds., *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 287–306).

<sup>58</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,14,21: CSEL 91, 142 f.

<sup>59</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,14,21: CSEL 91, 142.

<sup>60</sup> ... *non enim diabolo imputatur nisi voluntas sua qua conatur facere male* (*De Gen. Manich.* II,28,42: CSEL 91, 170).

<sup>61</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,15,22: CSEL 91, 143 f.

<sup>62</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,17,25: CSEL 91, 147. The new conception of Adam's sin as pride ("to want to belong to oneself in the way God belongs to himself") as it appears in this work was recognized by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 63.

<sup>63</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,15,22: CSEL 91, 143 f. This twofold relationship of the subordination of the lower to the higher is part of the order of created things; see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L'ordre*, 118–120; on the violation of the order, see *ibid.* 340–345.

<sup>64</sup> *De Gen. Manich.* I,18,29: CSEL 91, 96 f.; *De Gen. Manich.* I,16,26: CSEL 91, 93.

also lose control over their own affections (*affectiones et motus animi*),<sup>65</sup> and the partnership of two people is no longer joyful spiritual mutuality, having degenerated into an urge of carnal procreation.<sup>66</sup> Instead of turning towards God-Truth, men have turned towards themselves, and thus lost God's light (they are "naked"; Gen. 3:7).<sup>67</sup>

Referring to the biblical story, Augustine makes a distinction between the human condition "before sin" (*antequam anima peccaret*),<sup>68</sup> which is given by the perfect voluntary intention of the free creator, and the condition "after sin" (*post peccatum*),<sup>69</sup> in which the original order is disturbed due to the human will: men are not subject to God, and are not obeyed by other things. A crevice appears in the universe of will because of the will itself.

In connection with our theme, it is noteworthy that in this early work of Augustine's we can find a mention to the effect that our good deeds are actually done by God in us, for he urges us to do them, he invites us to want them in the first place, and gives us the strength to perform them:

... [B]ecause, too, our good works themselves are to be attributed to him who calls us, who instructs us, who shows us the way of truth, who entices us also to will and furnishes us with the strength to fulfil his commands. ... [A]nd he is the one who works these good works in us, ordering us to work them ...<sup>70</sup>

Here Augustine does not mean that the crevice in the universe of will deprives men of the ability to perform good deeds by their own will, but he seeks to describe the perfect harmony of human and God's actions: just

<sup>65</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* I,20,31: CSEL 91, 98.

<sup>66</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* I,19,30: CSEL 91, 97 f. This notion of the origin of carnal intercourse of the first people is later abandoned by Augustine, see below, chap. II.3.4; III.3.1. On the development of his teaching on marriage, see E.A. Clark, "Adam's Only Companion: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage", in: *RechAug* 21, 1986, 139–162.

<sup>67</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,16,24: CSEL 91, 146 f.

<sup>68</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* II,3,5: CSEL 91, 123.

<sup>69</sup> See *De Gen. Manich.* I,18,29: CSEL 91, 96.

<sup>70</sup> ... et ipsa bona opera nostra illi tribuenda sunt qui vocat, qui praecipit, qui viam veritatis ostendit, qui ut et velimus invitatur et vires implendi ea quae imperat subministrat (*De Gen. Manich.* I,22,34: CSEL 91, 103 f.). ... et ipse in nobis haec bona operatur, qui ut operemur iubet (*De Gen. Manich.* I,25,43: CSEL 91, 113 f.). English translation after E. Hill, 62 and 68. The passages in question are already accentuated by A. Niebergall, who admits, nevertheless, that they do not yet refer to God as the only efficient cause of good acts ("Alleinwirksamkeit Gottes"), see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 63. On the contrary, great importance to this place in the context of the development of Augustine's doctrine of grace is attributed by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 70.

as we read in Scripture that God rested after his work (Gen. 2:2), in the sense of his giving the rest to man, or that the Holy Spirit intercedes for us (Rom. 8:26) when he enables men to pray, so we can say that our good deeds are done by God himself because he makes it possible for us to do them.<sup>71</sup>

2.5. *The Analysis of the Will according to*  
*De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII 1–61*

Augustine addresses himself to the issue of the will in several questions of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, which can be dated to this period.<sup>72</sup> According to this work, the perfection of man created by God's will (which has no source but itself<sup>73</sup>) includes the fact that man is to be good on account of his own will (*voluntate*), not by necessity (*necessitate*). That is why humans were endowed with free will (*voluntas libera*), which also involves the possibility of corruption (the cause of corruption of free human beings cannot be anything but their own will: the will cannot be overcome by violence and to persuasion it must succumb voluntarily).<sup>74</sup> The soul, capable of giving local movement to the body, is also endowed with the ability to move itself spontaneously (*motus spontaneus*), by its own will.<sup>75</sup> This free choice of its will (*liberum voluntatis arbitrium*) is the source of right and wrong acts as well, which deserve a reward and a punishment, respectively (*meritum poenae peccatum*, *meritum praemii recte factum*). The just distribution is guaranteed by God, who in his providence (*providentia*) sees that everything takes place according to merit (*nullum immerito*) and nothing happens accidentally (*casu, temere*).<sup>76</sup> In God everything past and future abides as present,<sup>77</sup> and his providence can use even evil people for the benefit of others.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *De Gen. Manich.* 1,22,34: CSEL 91, 102.

<sup>72</sup> From his own account, Augustine began this collection after returning to Africa on the basis of his older notes and finished it after his consecration as bishop (see *Retract.* 1,26: CCL 57, 74).

<sup>73</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 28: CCL 44A, 35.

<sup>74</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 2–4: CCL 44A, 11–13.

<sup>75</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 8: CCL 44A, 15.

<sup>76</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 24: CCL 44A, 29 f.; similarly *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 53,1–2: CCL 44A, 87–90.

<sup>77</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 17: CCL 44A, 22.

<sup>78</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 27: CCL 44A, 33 f.

But how is it that in human souls, belonging to the same nature, different wills arise? Augustine holds that people have different fantasy images (*visa*),<sup>79</sup> which evoke different appetites (*appetitus*). The realisation of these appetites (*successus adipiscendi*) constitutes habits (*consuetudines*), and these give rise to the will (*voluntas*).<sup>80</sup> In comparison with the exegesis of Gen. 3, the structure observable here is more complex: the will is no longer a spontaneous movement by means of which reason gives its consent to the desire evoked by an immediate stimulus; instead, it is a spring which directs human action toward the goal on the basis of a habit. Augustine does not say it explicitly, yet in this analysis the will does become partially conditioned after all, much as it is conditioned by its own previous decisions in the first place.

In addition to the distinction between the human condition “before the fall” (*ante lapsum*) and “after the fall” (*post lapsum*),<sup>81</sup> the collection *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* also includes a periodisation of salvation history into “before the law” (*ante legem*), “under the law” (*sub lege*) and “under grace” (*sub gratia*), and their culmination in “perfect peace” (*plenissima pax*).<sup>82</sup> Although the account of the third age as the age of “grace of Christian faith” (*fidei christianae gratia*) as it appears in question 61 resembles the way in which the term “grace” was employed in the work *De vera religione* (to be dealt with in greater detail shortly), the Pauline theme of the subsequent questions 66 through 76 is rather connected with the New Testament motives which came to preoccupy Augustine after he became a presbyter in 391, and they will be covered as such in that context. Finally, it is worth mentioning here that in question 31 Augustine still uses the term *gratia* in the sense of “gratitude”, and in the classification of virtues, taken over from Cicero, he ranges it under the heading of justice as a virtue which “has regard for remembering and returning services, honours and acts of friendliness”.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>79</sup> The term *visum* is presumably translated from the Greek φαντασία as employed by Cicero; see *Acad. poster.* I,11,40: Reid 151; *Acad. priora* II,6,18: Reid 195.

<sup>80</sup> *Ex diversis visis diversus appetitus animarum, ex diverso appetitu diversus adipiscendi successus, ex diverso successu diversa consuetudo, ex diversa consuetudine diversa est voluntas* (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 40: CCL 44A, 62).

<sup>81</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 30: CCL 44A, 40.

<sup>82</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 61: CCL 44A, 129 f.

<sup>83</sup> ... *gratia in qua amicitiarum et officiorum alterius memoria et remunerandi voluntas continetur* (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 31,1: CCL 44A, 42,21 f.). See Cicero, *Inv.* II,53,161: Achard 225. The whole classification of virtues *ibid.*, 53,159–54,167: Achard 224–227.

2.6. *Gratia As Grace in De vera religione*

The work *De vera religione* is Augustine's first comprehensive treatise on Christian faith.<sup>84</sup> It is symptomatic that it is here that we find for the first time the expression *gratia* in the theological sense of "grace"<sup>85</sup> as what characterises the New Testament situation: Christianity as "a spiritual people" (*spiritualis populi gratia*)<sup>86</sup> within the framework of the historical economy of salvation (*dispensatio temporalis divinae providentiae pro salute generis humani*).<sup>87</sup> The spiritual people—the church—endow everyone with the "capacity to participate in God's grace" (*gratiae Dei participandae potestatem*).<sup>88</sup> This grace was realised in the incarnation of Christ, to which, according to Augustine's (anti-Manichaeic) interpretation, the Old Testament pointed, and its contents consist in calling people to freedom.<sup>89</sup> Yet only they can be perfectly free who abide by the "immutable law" (*incommutabilis lex*),<sup>90</sup> superior to the human mind, as the measure of all things.<sup>91</sup> The first man turned away from this law, which gives things the right order, to things themselves, abusing thus his ability to exercise his will freely (*liberum arbitrium*).<sup>92</sup> Such a voluntary violation (*voluntarius defectus*) of God's order makes men similar to what they turned towards—they, too, have become subject to transitoriness and mortality.<sup>93</sup> As a result of human attachment to things, their transitoriness has acquired a tragic aspect of

<sup>84</sup> On the composition of this work, see W. Desch, "Aufbau und Gliederung von Augustins Schrift *De vera religione*", in: *VCh* 35, 1980, 263–277; I. Bochet, "*Le firmament de l'Écriture*". *L'herméneutique augustinienne*, Paris 2004, 334–340 (in contrast to the older suspicion that the whole work is a rather inorganic mixture of Neoplatonic and Christian elements, as maintained by H. Dörries, "Das Verhältnis des Neuplatonischen und Christlichen in Augustins *de vera religione*", in: *ZNW* 23, 1924, 64–102).

<sup>85</sup> This occurrence of the expression *gratia* is recognised by a range of scholars, see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 35; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 85, who pays special attention to the whole work in the context of the development of Augustine's doctrine of grace (84–143). J. Lössl in accordance with his interpretation of grace points out that the relationship between the understanding (*intellectus*, "Einsicht") and grace is emphasized here for the first time (J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 43; for the whole interpretation of *De vera religione*, see 42–49).

<sup>86</sup> See *De vera relig.* 7,12: *CCL* 32, 196.

<sup>87</sup> See *De vera relig.* 7,13: *CCL* 32, 196.

<sup>88</sup> See *De vera relig.* 6,10: *CCL* 32, 194.

<sup>89</sup> See *De vera relig.* 17,33: *CCL* 32, 207.

<sup>90</sup> See *De vera relig.* 46,87: *CCL* 32, 244.

<sup>91</sup> See *De vera relig.* 30,54–58: *CCL* 32, 222–226.

<sup>92</sup> See *De vera relig.* 37,68: *CCL* 32, 231.

<sup>93</sup> See *De vera relig.* 11,21–22: *CCL* 32, 200.

futility (*vanitas*).<sup>94</sup> Thus evil, having entered the world through human freedom, has both an active and a passive side (*facere et pati*),<sup>95</sup> namely the transgression itself (*peccatum*) and the punishment for it (*poena peccati*).<sup>96</sup> The punishment for humans does not consist in mortality only, but also in the “difficulty” (*difficultas*)<sup>97</sup> and “pain” (*dolor*) of both the body and mind which will henceforth accompany their lives and manacle them to their own desires.<sup>98</sup>

Grace (*gratia*) has the role here of a force by means of which men can overcome their desires (*cupiditates*) provided they submit their “mind and good will” (*mente ... et bona voluntate*) to it. Then the soul is renewed, reformed (*reformata*) by God’s wisdom (which is not formed but everything is formed by it), and man becomes “spiritual” (*homo spiritualis*), for he “returns from a multitude of transitory things to the one immutable” and enjoys God through the Holy Spirit.<sup>99</sup> Only in this way can the sin of men and the punishment for it be overcome and the original order restored: transitory things will serve men again and they in turn will serve God; the new body will overcome death and the “essence (*essentia*) will conquer nothingness (*nihil*)”.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>94</sup> See *De vera relig.* 22,41: CCL 32, 212.

<sup>95</sup> See *De vera relig.* 20,39: CCL 32, 211.

<sup>96</sup> See *De vera relig.* 12,23: CCL 32, 202. According to P.-M. Hombert, the distinction between sin and punishment appears for the first time in *De mus.* VI,5,14 (see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 65 f., n. 116); however, the dating of this text is uncertain (V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 82 incl. n. 186).

<sup>97</sup> *Vitium ergo animae est quod fecit, et difficultas ex vitio poena quam patitur. Et hoc est totum malum* (*De vera relig.* 20,39: CCL 32, 211).

<sup>98</sup> *Trahitur ergo ad poenas, quia diligendo inferiora in egestate voluptatum suarum et in doloribus apud inferos ordinatur. Quid est enim dolor qui dicitur corporis, nisi corruptio repentina salutis eius rei, quam male utendo anima corruptioni obnoxiauit? Quid autem dolor qui dicitur animi, nisi carere mutabilibus rebus, quibus fruebatur aut frui se posse speraverat? Et hoc est totum quod dicitur malum, id est peccatum et poena peccati* (*De vera relig.* 12,23: CCL 32, 202).

<sup>99</sup> *Si autem, dum in hoc stadio vitae humanae anima degit, vincat eas, quas adversum se nutrit, cupiditates fruendo mortalibus et ad eas vincendas gratia Dei se adiuvare credat mente illi serviens et bona voluntate, sine dubitatione reparabitur et a multis mutabilibus ad unum incommutabile revertetur reformata per sapientiam non formatam, sed per quam formantur universa, frueturque Deo per spiritum sanctum, quod est donum Dei* (*De vera relig.* 12,24: CCL 32, 202). Among others, it is from this passage that J. Lössl infers the “intellectual orientation” of grace in the whole work (J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 45). On the other hand, I. Bochet points out the motif of grace as the soul’s recovery from concupiscence through the right religion, which, at the same time, completes philosophy (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 333–385).

<sup>100</sup> *De vera relig.* 12,25: CCL 32, 202 f.; *De vera relig.* 16,32: CCL 32, 207. On this idea of

It must be mentioned here that this new possibility, grasped by means of freedom, is conditioned by the coming of God's wisdom in the form of man, i.e., in the nature which was to be set free (*ipsa natura suscipienda erat quae liberanda*) in both sexes (that is why Christ came as a man born from a woman).<sup>101</sup> The incarnation shows the excellence of human nature (*excelsum locum*)<sup>102</sup> and, supposing men maintain the right order, also its happy future in resurrection.<sup>103</sup>

It could be presumably concluded that the incarnation of Christ (the realisation of grace) shows the men gone astray their original calling, which they can still achieve through their "good will" if they give their consent to grace. Grace (*gratia*), related to the Holy Spirit at the end of the treatise, gives then reconciliation to men, for by following Christ as the form (*forma*) they will return to the Father-Beginning (*principium*).<sup>104</sup>

What is also of interest here is the mention of the law of God's providence establishing that the knowledge of grace (*ad cognoscendam et percipiendam gratiam Dei*) one has achieved with the help of "superiors" (the more advanced ones) enjoins him to aid "the subordinate ones" in gaining this knowledge.<sup>105</sup> Grace is not only God's aid to an astray and enslaved human being in overcoming the captivity of his desires and becoming a free "spiritual man", but it also represents a force whose knowledge one human being is to mediate to another and thus participate in the rise of all "spiritual people".<sup>106</sup>

\*\*\*

---

Augustine's, see E. Zum Brunn, *Le dilemme de l'être et du néant chez saint Augustin. Des premiers dialogues aux Confessions*, Paris 1969, 70–72. On the *essentia–nihil* polarity and the question of Augustine's modification of Plotinian (rather than Porphyrian) ontology, see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 113–121.

<sup>101</sup> See *De vera relig.* 16,30: CCL 32, 205 f.

<sup>102</sup> See *De vera relig.* 16,30: CCL 32, 205.

<sup>103</sup> See *De vera relig.* 16,32: CCL 32, 207.

<sup>104</sup> See *De vera relig.* 55,113: CCL 32, 260. Christ is thus primarily regarded as a model and a teacher (see A. Pincherle, *La formazione teologica di Sant'Agostino*, Roma ca. 1940, 48; J.P. Burns, *Development*, 27 f.). In this respect, A. Niebergall is correct in his reproof that the notion of grace lacks Christological embedding (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 64 and 72–74).

<sup>105</sup> See *De vera relig.* 28,51: CCL 32, 220.

<sup>106</sup> See *De vera relig.* 7,12: CCL 32, 196; *De vera relig.* 6,10: CCL 32, 194. In his interpretation of this work, K. Janssen even speaks of two "classes of people", although the membership of an individual in either of them is not unequivocal (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 97). On the details of the birth of the new man from the old one, see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 127–130.

In his anti-Manichaean theodicy,<sup>107</sup> the early Augustine accentuates on the one hand the voluntary character of God's creation, which emerges perfect from God's hands, and the origin of evil in the human will on the other. Human will violates the order established by God, making thus a crevice in the perfection of creation. In this respect, a distinction must be made between the active and passive sides of evil; i.e., sin as a violation of God's order and the punishment for the sin in the form of the disruption of the order. Sin, which always comes out of the will, violates God's order in such a way that concupiscence seduces reason instead of being subject to it. The motive can either consist in an inappropriate embrace of sensible things at the exclusion of the spiritual ones, or in pride revolting against God's domain. The punishment takes the form of men's growing in likeness to what they have preferred, i.e., mortality, on the one hand; and a loss of control over subordinate things, i.e., difficulty, which deprives men of the free disposing of them (e.g. enslavement by one's own desires), on the other. From this unpropitious condition men are set free by God's grace, realised in the coming of Christ as a man who raises again the possibility of restoring the original order, returning to men their dignity, realised in the embrace of spiritual things, and thus founding all "spiritual people".<sup>108</sup> This is also described by Augustine as the love of God, "poured out into human hearts through the Holy Spirit".

---

<sup>107</sup> As A. Niebergall observes, the analyses of sin carried out by the early Augustine are a kind of a "by-product" of his theodicy, later resulting in his concern with grace. The sequence of the themes can be described as follows: seeking the truth—theodicy—sin—grace (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 50f.). On the other hand, V.H. Drecoll takes the view that the more detailed analyses of sin co-occur with the interest in grace in *De vera religione* as a result of Augustine's conception of God as the measure of all things (*summus modus*); however, he leaves aside *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 82f.).

<sup>108</sup> The extension of Augustine's perspective from an individual to the church community is in J.P. Burns' opinion related to his return to Africa, where the "spiritual universalism" of his Neoplatonic period collided with the reality of the church of common people and, at last, "shattered on the rock of Paul's epistles" (J.P. Burns, *Development*, 30). However, as V.H. Drecoll remarks, the extension of the perspective from an individual to the whole of mankind, where an important role is assigned to a people with a special calling, has its counterpart in Manichaeism (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 136f.).





## CHAPTER THREE

### PAULINE THEMES

(THE PERIOD OF THE PRESBYTERATE: 391–395)

After his ordination as presbyter in African Hippo Regius in 391, Augustine follows up with the issues he dealt with in his previous works, but there is also a noticeable increase in his concern with the New Testament Pauline themes, culminating in his attempt to comment on the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, crucial for the apostle's conception of grace. The following themes will be presented as characteristic of this period: (1) Augustine's reflections upon the influence of a bad habit on the will, including the statement concerning the divided will (according to *De duabus animabus*, *Contra Fortunatum* and the third book of *De libero arbitrio*); (2) the adoption of people as sons of God (*De fide et symbolo*, *De sermone Domini in monte*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, and *De Genesi imperfectus liber*); and, finally, (3) Augustine's expositions of the epistles to the Romans (especially Rom. 7–9) and to the Galatians, in which his interpretation of Pauline theology is introduced in the most systematic way.

#### 3.1. "I Do What I Will Not to Do"

(*De duabus animabus*, *Contra Fortunatum*, *De libero arbitrio III*)

We have already encountered the role of habit, arising from the repeated realisation of an appetite and influencing the will, in Augustine's early reflections on the will. In his anti-Manichean polemic *De duabus animabus*, Augustine links the "sinful habit" or "the habit of sinning" (*consuetudo peccati*),<sup>1</sup> which arises by turning away from the higher to the lower (in other words, by turning away from the internal to the external and from the spiritual to the sensible), with difficulty (*difficultas*) and the hidden propensity (*occulta suasio*) to evil with which the human desire for good works collides.<sup>2</sup> The consequence of the previous voluntary decision—habit—thus

---

<sup>1</sup> See *De duabus anim.* 14,23: BA 17, 112.

<sup>2</sup> See *De duabus anim.* 13,19–20: BA 17, 104–106. J.P. Burns relates the habit restricting human freedom to human mortality (drawing from *De fide et symb.* 10,23 and *Contra Fort.* 22); however, he makes it clear that the restricting habit as conditioned by the will must

becomes an obstacle to following good will. In the form of habit as its sediment, the will turns against itself:

So it happens, that when we strive after better things, habit formed by connection with the flesh and our sins in some way begin to militate against us and to put obstacles in our way.<sup>3</sup>

Although Augustine insists on the synchronously unequivocal character of the will (it is impossible to want and not want a thing at the same time),<sup>4</sup> he is also aware of the precarious situation of humans divided between the “flesh” (*caro*) and “spirit” (*spiritus*), i.e., pleasure (*voluptas*) and virtue (*honestas*), “placed in the midst of which we fluctuate” (*in medio positi fluctuamus*):

For it was my own experience to feel that I am one, considering evil and good and choosing one or the other, but for the most part the one pleases, the other is fitting, placed in the midst of which we fluctuate. Nor is it to be wondered at, for we are now so constituted that through the flesh we can be affected by sensual pleasure, and through the spirit by honorable considerations.<sup>5</sup>

His previous outlook on the will has thus undergone a certain emendation in which an important role was probably played by the polemic against the Manichaeans.<sup>6</sup>

---

be distinguished from the limitation on disposing of one's own body as the involuntary consequence of mortality (J.P. Burns, *Development*, 24 incl. n. 56).

<sup>3</sup> *Ideo contingit ut cum ad meliora conantibus nobis, consuetudo facta cum carne et peccata nostra quodam modo militare contra nos, et difficultatem nobis facere coeperint* (*De duabus anim.* 13,19: BA 17, 106). English translation by A.H. Newman, 106.

<sup>4</sup> See *De duabus anim.* 10,14: BA 17, 90.

<sup>5</sup> *Nam mihi cum accidit, unum me esse sentio utrumque considerantem, alterutrum eligentem: sed plerumque illud libet, hoc decet, quorum nos in medio positi fluctuamus. Nec mirum: ita enim nunc constituti sumus, ut et per carnem voluptate affici, et per spiritum honestate posimus* (*De duabus anim.* 13,19: BA 17, 104). English translation by A.H. Newman, 105.

<sup>6</sup> V.H. Drecoll compares Augustine's deepening analysis of the limited freedom of the human will with the conception present in the Manichaean text of uncertain origin *Epistola ad Menoch* (which existed in the Latin version, see below, chap. III.3.4 incl. n. 137), in order to show certain similarities and disparities (V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 187–199). What is of importance here is the fact that the polemic against the Manichaeans provided the context in which Augustine developed his conception; for all his reinterpretations of the Manichaean dualistic anthropology, its influence upon Augustine's expositions of Paul's theology is evident (see E. Feldmann, “Der junge Augustinus und Paulus. Ein Beitrag zur (manichäischen) Paulus-Rezeption”, in: L. Cirilo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico”*, Louvain—Napoli 1997, 41–76).

In his recorded public disputation with Fortunatus the Manichaean<sup>7</sup> (in the spring of 392 in Hippo), Augustine defends the notion of the source of evil in the will—as a result of which the soul, created as good, corrupted itself—against the dualistic interpretation of Pauline works.<sup>8</sup> Here Fortunatus argues that the soul is exposed to necessity, to the power of the “flesh”, thus “sinning against its will” (*inviti peccamus, nolens peccavit*),<sup>9</sup> and he also refers to the apostle’s statements from Rom. 7:23–25.<sup>10</sup> This brings Augustine to a more detailed analysis of this passage of the New Testament.<sup>11</sup> In his exposition, every man is endowed with the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*), but through his own fault gets entangled in habit (*consuetudo*) which he cannot overcome all by himself. The regularity of this unpropitious necessity (*necessitas*) follows from the sin of the father of humankind, of whom—and him only—it can be said that the free exercise of his will was unburdened:

I say that there was free exercise of will in that man who was first formed. He was so made that absolutely nothing could resist his will, if he had willed to keep the precepts of God. But after he voluntarily sinned, we who have descended from his stock were plunged into necessity.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> On Fortunatus, see F. Decret, *Aspects*, 39–50. It might have been the discussion with Fortunatus which drew Augustine’s attention to the following passages in the New Testament: Eph. 2:3; Gal. 5:17; Rom. 7:15, 18–19, and, consequently, to the view of sin as the ancestral burden of Adam’s sons, not just a voluntary act which can be avoided (see M.E. Alflatt, “The Development of the Idea of Involuntary Sin in St. Augustine”, in: *REAug* 20, 1974, 113–134).

<sup>8</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 15: BA 17, 148; *Contra Fort.* 15: BA 17, 162–164.

<sup>9</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 20: BA 17, 166.

<sup>10</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 21: BA 17, 174. On the Manichaean New Testament hermeneutics, see M. Tardieu, “Principes de l’exégèse manichéenne de Nouveau Testament”, in: idem (ed.), *Les règles de l’interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146 (on the reception of Paul, see especially 132–142); A. Hoffmann, “Verfälschung der Jesus-Tradition. Neutestamentliche Texte in der Manichäisch-Augustinischen Kontroverse”, in: L. Cirilo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso*, 149–182; F. Decret, “L’utilisation des Épîtres de Paul chez les Manichéens d’Afrique”, in: J. Ries e.a., *Le Epistole Paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Roma 1989, 29–83.

<sup>11</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 21: BA 17, 174. The importance of this biblical text and its employment in the polemic with Fortunatus with respect to the development of Augustine’s notion of the will is recognised by a range of scholars, see e.g. K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 103; M.E. Alflatt, “The Development”; I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 200–208. The role of Paul’s theology in the whole polemic is also discussed by B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin, lecteur et interprète de saint Paul dans le De peccatorum meritis et remissione (hiver 411–412)*, Paris 1996, 93f. The novelty of Augustine’s interpretation of Pauline themes exemplified in Rom. 7:16 is demonstrated by J. Doignon, “«J’acquiesce à la loi» (Rom. 7,16) dans l’exégèse latine ancienne”, in: *FZPhTh* 29, 1982, 131–139.

<sup>12</sup> *Liberum voluntatis arbitrium in illo homine fuisse dico, qui primus formatus est. Ille sic factus est, ut nihil omnino voluntati eius resisteret, si vellet Dei praecepta servare. Postquam*

The “necessity of our habit”, which binds mankind as a punishment for his transgression, is the reason why men do “not do” what they want to do (cf. Rom. 7:15). It is nevertheless a conflict of two contrary wills (*voluntates*), not two contrary natures (*naturae*), as the Manichaeans would have it:

For to-day in our actions before we are implicated by any habit, we have free choice of doing anything or not doing it. But when by that liberty we have done something and the pernicious sweetness and pleasure of that deed has taken hold upon the mind, by its own habit the mind is so implicated that afterwards it cannot conquer what by sinning it has fashioned for itself. ... And this is what wars against the soul, habit formed in the flesh. ... [A]s long as we live according to the flesh, which is also called the old man, we have the necessity of our habit, so that we may not do what we will.<sup>13</sup>

From the apostle’s account it follows that the split of the will can only be overcome by God’s grace (*gratia*), which inspires man with God’s love and thus subjects the human will to God himself. Man is set free from the “law of sin and of death”; his spirit submits to justice, and so does the body to the spirit. Free of the split, the whole man as spirit and body can rise from death:

But on account of the grace of God, which frees us from the law of sin and of death, having been converted to righteousness we are freed; so that afterwards this same flesh tortures us with its punishment so long as we remain in sins, is subjected to us in resurrection, and shakes us by no adversity from keeping the law of God and His precepts.<sup>14</sup>

Against the Manichaean exposition of God sending souls—compliant with their lot—to the opposite nature like “sheep in the midst of wolves” (Matt. 10:16) to fight against the hostile forces in order to come back to him,<sup>15</sup>

---

*autem ipse libera voluntate peccavit, nos in necessitatem praecipitati sumus, qui ab eius stirpe descendimus* (Contra Fort. 22: BA 17, 174–176). English translation by A.H. Newman, 121.

<sup>13</sup> *Hodie namque in nostris actionibus antequam consuetudine aliqua implicemur, liberum habemus arbitrium faciendi aliquid, vel non faciendi. Cum autem ista libertate fecerimus aliquid, et facti ipsius tenuerit animam perniciose dulcedo et voluptas, eadem ipsa sua consuetudine sic implicatur, ut postea vincere non possit, quod sibi ipsa peccando fabricata est. ... Et hoc est quod adversus animam pugnat, consuetudo facta in carne. ... quamdiu secundum carnem vivimus, qui vetus etiam homo nominatur, habemus necessitatem consuetudinis nostrae, ut non quod volumus faciamus.* (Contra Fort. 22: BA 17, 176–178). English translation by A.H. Newman, 121f.

<sup>14</sup> *Propter autem gratiam Dei, quae nos liberat a lege peccati et mortis, ad iustitiam conversi liberamur: ut postea eadem ipsa caro quae nos poenis torsit in peccatis manentes, subiiciatur nobis in resurrectione, et nulla adversitate nos quatiat, quominus legem Dei et divina praecepta servemus* (Contra Fort. 22: BA 17, 180). English translation by A.H. Newman, 122.

<sup>15</sup> See Contra Fort. 22: BA 17, 180–182; Contra Fort. 27: BA 17, 186; Contra Fort. 34: BA 17, 190.

Augustine posits his conception of the fall of the soul caused solely by its own freedom<sup>16</sup> and punished (*poena peccati*)<sup>17</sup> by the involuntary split of the will.

The analysis of the human will in its split also appears in books 2 and especially 3 of *De libero arbitrio*, where Augustine goes on to elaborate on the premises and consequences of his conception of the will.<sup>18</sup>

Free will must be a good gift from the creator because there can be no good action without it,<sup>19</sup> but it can also be used for the wrong end (that is why Augustine calls it the “middle good”, *bonum medium*).<sup>20</sup> The question arises: From where does the wrong movement of the will in turning away from God come? From nothingness (*nihil*) perhaps, as the absence of all—even the incipient—form (*inchoatio formae*) and all good? Augustine admits he does not know (for it is impossible to know nothingness); he only makes it clear that this turning away is “in our power”. This does not mean, however, that the movement is reversible: the will, once turned away, can no longer turn to the good on its own.<sup>21</sup>

Men are then enslaved by their desires (*libido*)<sup>22</sup> to such an extent that they are in fact deprived of the freedom of the will:

We must not be surprised that man in his ignorance does not enjoy the free choice of will to choose the right thing to do or, though aware of what is right and with a will to do it, that he is unable to accomplish it against the opposition of carnal habits which have somehow become ingrown in nature by the element of unrestraint handed on in human heredity.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>16</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 25: BA 17, 184.

<sup>17</sup> See *Contra Fort.* 15: BA 17, 148–150.

<sup>18</sup> On the second book of *De libero arbitrio*, which contains, among others, the ascent to God coming from the self-experience of the thinking spirit, see O. du Roy, *L'intelligence*, 241–256; F. De Capitani, “Studio introduttivo”, 115–146; idem, “*Quomodo sit manifestum deum esse: Lettura del libro II*”, in: L.F. Pizzolato (ed.), “*De Libero Arbitrio*”, 35–57. On the third book, see F. De Capitani, “Studio introduttivo”, 147–182; R. Holte, “St. Augustine on Free Will (*De libero arbitrio*, III)”, in: L.F. Pizzolato (ed.), “*De Libero Arbitrio*”, 67–84.

<sup>19</sup> See *De lib. arb.* II, 18, 49, 189: CCL 29, 270.

<sup>20</sup> See *De lib. arb.* II, 19, 52, 196: CCL 29, 272.

<sup>21</sup> See *De lib. arb.* II, 20, 54, 201–205: CCL 29, 272 f.

<sup>22</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III, 1, 2, 8–9: CCL 29, 275.

<sup>23</sup> *Nec mirandum est quod vel ignorando non habet arbitrium liberum voluntatis ad eligendum quod recte faciat, vel resistente carnali consuetudine, quae violentia mortalis successionis quodam modo naturaliter inolevit, videat quid recte faciendum sit et velit nec possit implere* (*De lib. arb.* III, 18, 52, 177: CCL 29, 305). English translation after R.P. Russell, 212, and M. Pontifex, 193. However, as R. Holte points out, the loss of the free choice of the will is only partial: men have lost the possibility of turning towards God on their own, but they have not lost the possibility of choosing between individual things (see R. Holte, “St. Augustine”, 80 f.). Similarly, J.M. Rist emphasises that *liberum arbitrium* means for Augustine the responsibility of men

“Carnal habit” (*carnalis consuetudo*) shrouds men in ignorance of the truth and in the difficulty of doing good (*ignorantia veri, difficultas recti*<sup>24</sup>), depriving them thus of the possibility of wanting what is right or of the power of exercising their good will should they have it (Rom. 7:18–19).<sup>25</sup> Augustine classifies such a state as a “punishment” for sin (*poena, supplicium*) or as “sin” (*peccatum*) in the wider sense; the word does not need to refer to the free intentional act itself, but also to the (undesirable) consequences, just as the word “tongue” (*lingua*) renders both the organ and its function or the word “nature” (*natura*) refers both to the original state in which man was created and the present situation in which he has induced himself.<sup>26</sup>

Men, as members of Adam’s lineage, are born into their unpropitious second “nature”; i.e., the condition of ignorance and difficulty as the consequences of sin. This condition is no fault of their own (*non tibi deputatur ad culpam*), yet they do become guilty if they do not participate in its rectification and reject God’s help:

It is not counted to you as a fault that you are ignorant against your will, but that you fail to seek the knowledge you do not possess. Nor is it a fault that you do not tend your wounded members, but that you despise Him who wishes to heal them. These are your own sins. No man has been denied a knowledge of the benefit of inquiring after something where ignorance is of no benefit, or of how he should make humble avowal of his weakness so that when he seeks and when he confesses he may be helped by Him who neither errs when He gives help nor becomes weary of giving it.<sup>27</sup>

... [I]f ignorance of the truth and difficulty in doing right are natural to man and are the point of departure whence man begins his ascent to the happy state of wisdom and rest, no one is justified in reproaching happiness for its natural origin. But if a man is unwilling to advance or is willing to be a backslider, he rightly deserves to suffer the penalty.<sup>28</sup>

---

for their own acts rather than freedom in the sense of autonomy or freedom from sin; that is why men cannot exactly be said to have ever lost it (see J.M. Rist, “Augustine”, 423 and 425).

<sup>24</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,22,64,220: CCL 29, 313.

<sup>25</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,18,51,172–III,18,52,179: CCL 29, 305 f.

<sup>26</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,19,54,184–185: CCL 29, 306 f.

<sup>27</sup> ... *non tibi deputatur ad culpam quod invitus ignoras, sed quod negligis quaerere quod ignoras, neque illud quod vulnerata membra non colligis, sed quod volentem sanare contemnis; ista tua propria peccata sunt. Nulli enim homini ablatum est scire utiliter quaeri quod inutiliter ignoratur, et humiliter confitendam esse inbecillitatem, ut quaerenti et confitenti ille subveniat, qui nec errat dum subvenit nec laborat* (*De lib. arb.* III,19,53,181–182: CCL 29, 306). English translation after M. Pontifex, 194 f., and R.P. Russell, 213.

<sup>28</sup> ... *si ignorantia veri et difficultas recti naturalis est homini unde incipiat in sapientiae quietisque beatitudinem surgere, nullus hanc ex initio naturali recte arguit; sed si proficere noluerit*

Although men cannot influence the condition into which they are born, they are fully responsible for how they cope with it. Its ignorance and weakness notwithstanding, the human will is strong enough for them to at least want what they cannot achieve on their own and to reach it eventually with the help of their creator. By means of the help of their creator, they can still attain happiness:

... [F]rom the moment of turning to God, each one should not only be unhampered in his will but should even be aided in overcoming the punishment which his origin had merited by turning away from God. In this way, too, the Creator of the universe showed how easy it would have been for man, had he so willed, to preserve the condition in which he was created since even his offspring were able to overcome the condition that was theirs by birth.<sup>29</sup>

The difficulty of the situation into which men are born through no fault of their own also makes them seek help from God and thus find a closer relationship to him, not only as to a good creator, but a merciful giver of happiness as well:

Thus difficulty itself urges the soul to pray for help in the work of perfection from Him who, it realises, caused the work to begin. Thus it loves Him more, since not by its own strength but by the mercy of Him whose goodness gave it existence, it is raised to enjoy happiness. The more it loves the author of its being, the more firmly it rests in Him, and the more plentifully it enjoys His eternity.<sup>30</sup>

In this respect, two issues arise; the first one is mentioned in passing and remains unanswered. It is a technical question of how the condition of “sin” (at this point, in the sense of “punishment for sin”, not guilt) is inherited. Do sinful souls arise from one another, or is each newly created soul adapted on purpose to the level reached by its predecessors? Or could it be that the newly-created perfect souls are always sent (or do they descend by their own

---

*aut a profectu retrorsum relabi voluerit, iure meritoque poenas luet* (*De lib. arb.* III,22,64,220: CCL 29, 313). English translation by R.P. Russell, 223.

<sup>29</sup> ... *ex conversione ad Deum ut vinceret quisque supplicium quod origo eius ex aversione meruerat, non solum volentem non prohiberi, sed etiam adiuvare oportebat. Etiam sic enim rerum creator ostendit quanta facilitate potuisset homo, si voluisset, retinere quod factus est, cum proles eius potuit etiam superare quod nata est* (*De lib. arb.* III,20,55,187: CCL 29, 307). English translation after R.P. Russell, 215.

<sup>30</sup> ... *ut ex ipsa difficultate admoneatur eundem implorare adiutorem perfectionis suae quem inchoationis sentit auctorem, ut ex hoc ei fiat carior dum non suis viribus, sed, cuius bonitate habet ut sit, eius misericordia sublevatur ut beata sit. Quanto autem carior illi est a quo est, tanto in eo firmiter acquiescit, et tanto uberius eius aeternitate perfuitur* (*De lib. arb.* III,22,65,223: CCL 29, 314). English translation by M. Pontifex, 207 f.



will?) into bodies afflicted with inherited sin, which are the cause of their present ignorance and difficulty?<sup>31</sup> Augustine will later return to this issue in his doctrine of inherited sin without ever answering it completely.

The other problem, which seems more pressing to Augustine and the solution of which he probably still regards as satisfactory at this point, is the consistency of the human free will with divine foreknowledge. The context of theodicy of his thinking demands that men bear full responsibility for their will. Indeed, for all his reflections on the “punishable” condition of men, Augustine continues to claim that nothing is “in our power” so much as our will, and that the will has no other reason than itself:

Hence nothing is so much in our power as the will itself, for it is there at hand the very instant that we will something. Thus, we may truly say ... that we do not die freely, but of necessity, and so on. But not even a madman would venture to assert that we do not will by our will.<sup>32</sup>

Now what could precede the will and be its cause? Either it is the will itself, and nothing else than the will is the root, or it is not the will ...<sup>33</sup>

God does foreknow the human will, but he does not determine it; the fact that he knows beforehand that people will sin does not force them to sin.<sup>34</sup> Still, because of the perfect divine order, even sinful souls contribute to the perfection, justice and beauty of the universe because by them it is exemplified that sin deserves to be punished. This does not mean, however, that the universe would not be perfect without their transgressions: a just reward is rendered according to both the good and wrong deeds of the souls, constantly demonstrating the perfection of the divine order irrespective of human action.<sup>35</sup>

The soul, created from nothingness, is always indebted to God: either it returns by its good deeds what it has accepted (*reddit debitum*), or it rightly loses what it abuses; in either case it demonstrates the perfection

<sup>31</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,20,56,188–III,20,58,199; *CCL* 29, 307–309.

<sup>32</sup> *Quapropter nihil tam in nostra potestate quam ipsa voluntas est. Ea enim prorsus nullo intervallo mox ut volumus praesto est. Et ideo recte possumus dicere: ... “Non voluntate morimur, sed necessitate” et si quid aliud huius modi; “non voluntate autem volumus” quis vel delirus audeat dicere?* (*De lib. arb.* III,3,7,27; *CCL* 29, 279). English translation by R.P. Russell, 171 f.

<sup>33</sup> *Sed quae tandem esse poterit ante voluntatem causa voluntatis? Aut enim et ipsa voluntas est et a radice ista voluntatis non recedetur, aut non est voluntas* (*De lib. arb.* III,17,49,168; *CCL* 29, 304). English translation by M. Pontifex, 191.

<sup>34</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,3,7,28–29; *CCL* 29, 279; *De lib. arb.* III,4,9,37–39; *CCL* 29, 281; *De lib. arb.* III,6,18,63; *CCL* 29, 285 f.

<sup>35</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,9,25,91–III,9,26,95; *CCL* 29, 290 f.; *De lib. arb.* III,11,32,113; *CCL* 29, 294.

of the divine order.<sup>36</sup> On the contrary, God is not indebted to anyone (*nulli debet aliquid*) for he gives everything for free (*gratuito*); not only does he give being to everything without any previous possible merit, but even if he rewards the merits of the will through which someone becomes a better human being, it is again God himself who gives the wanting (namely the gift of the free choice of the will).<sup>37</sup>

Therefore, God does not cause the voluntary evil of free human beings; he only foreknows it. Men entangled in inherited ignorance and difficulty cannot achieve the good on their own, but they can want it despite their unpropitious condition and attain it when aided by their creator. If they do not do so, it is through their own fault for which they rightly deserve a punishment. Free will in itself does not attain the good towards which it turns (as it did in the first book of *De libero arbitrio*: this actually described—in light of hindsight and with respect to the whole work—only the situation of the first man before the Fall); instead, as a result of its inherited burden it rather attains evil unless it endeavours to avert it.

As far as the analysis of the will is concerned, the third book of *De libero arbitrio* also provides certain specifications. Besides the will (*voluntas*), Augustine also mentions “what is in our power” (*in potestate habere*), in our power being “what is there at hand the very instant that we will it”.<sup>38</sup> This holds for the will itself in the first place, which is why it is free (*libera*), but not necessarily for its fulfilment (for example, the will to happiness does not immediately lead to happiness):

... [W]e cannot deny that we have the power, unless the thing we are willing is absent. But when we will, if the will itself is absent, we do not will. If it is impossible that we should not will when we will, the will must be present when we will. Nothing else is in our power, if not what is present to us when we will. Our will would not be a will, if it were not in our power. Moreover, since it is in our power, it is free. What is not in our power, or may not be in our power, is not free to us.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,11,43,151–152: CCL 29, 301.

<sup>37</sup> ... *voluntatem liberam et sufficientissimam facultatem* (*De lib. arb.* III,16,45,155: CCL 29, 302).

<sup>38</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,3,7,27: CCL 29, 279 (quoted above, chap. I.3.1, n. 32).

<sup>39</sup> *Non enim negare possumus habere nos potestatem, nisi dum nobis non adest quod volumus; dum autem volumus, si voluntas ipsa deest nobis, non utique volumus. Quod si fieri non potest ut dum volumus non velimus, adest utique voluntas volentibus nec aliud quicquam est in potestate nisi quod volentibus adest. Voluntas igitur nostra nec voluntas esset nisi esset in nostra potestate. Porro, quia est in potestate, libera est nobis. Non enim est nobis liberum quod in potestate non habemus, aut potest non esse quod habemus* (*De lib. arb.* III,3,8,32–33: CCL 29, 280). English translation after M. Pontifex, 148.

If it was in my power to be happy, I should be happy now. I want to be happy now, and am not ...<sup>40</sup>

A gap known from Paul's epistles thus opens up between the will and its fulfilment, a gap which will go on to become an abyss in Augustine's further reflections.

Another theme Augustine is concerned with is the intentionality of the will. The will always turns towards something,<sup>41</sup> namely the fantasy images (*visum*) which emerge in the mind.<sup>42</sup> These images are of various origins: either they have been suggested to us by the will of someone else (*a voluntate suadentis*), or they come from things with which our spirit or our senses have come into contact.<sup>43</sup> In any case, these images or projections which set the will in motion by their attraction are not in its power. What is in the power of the will is only whether it will be moved by them or not:

The will is not drawn to perform an action except by a [fantasy] image (*aliquid visum*). We have it in our power to accept or reject it, but we have no power to decide what image shall affect us (*quo viso tangatur*). We must agree that the soul is affected by both higher and lower images in such a way that a rational being takes what it chooses from both, and deserves unhappiness or happiness in accordance with its choice.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, the concern with the will is related to Augustine's idea of a kind of an intermediate moral condition (*media adfectio*) in which the first man was situated, i.e., a neutral state in between culpable foolishness and attained wisdom. In the way he was created by God, man was predisposed neither with wisdom (for in such a case he would not have turned away from God) nor foolishness (for in that case he would not be culpable for his turning away from God), but only with rationality as the capacity to understand God's command. Only by its observing or not observing conditioned by the

---

<sup>40</sup> *Mihi si esset potestas ut essem beatus, iam profecto essem. Volo enim etiam nunc et non sum ...* (*De lib. arb.* III,3,7,26: CCL 29, 279). English translation after M. Pontifex, 146.

<sup>41</sup> *Qui enim vult, profecto aliquid vult* (*De lib. arb.* III,25,75,259: CCL 29, 320).

<sup>42</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,25,74,255: CCL 29, 319. On the term *visum*, see above, chap. I.2.5 incl. n. 79.

<sup>43</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,25,75,259: CCL 29, 320.

<sup>44</sup> *Sed quia voluntatem non allicit ad faciendum quodlibet nisi aliquod visum, quid autem quisque velumat vel respuat est in potestate, sed quo viso tangatur nulla potestas est, fatendum est et ex superioribus et ex inferioribus visis animum tangi ut rationalis substantia ex utroqueumat quod voluerit et ex merito sumendi vel miseria vel beatitas subsequatur* (*De lib. arb.* III,25,74,255: CCL 29, 319). English translation after M. Pontifex, 216 f.

will could he reach wisdom or foolishness, respectively, and thus happiness or misery.<sup>45</sup> The neutrality is, however, characteristic only of the very beginning of human action, for every movement of the will is going to divert it to one side or the other and become part of every human situation to follow. In *De libero arbitrio*, Augustine still presumes that the neutral innocence of the beginning is given to each newborn human being.<sup>46</sup> As we will see, he will go on to reserve it for the very beginning of mankind, while all children will be born burdened with the guilt of their predecessors.

Augustine's solution of the issue concerning the relationship between human free will and God's help in *De libero arbitrio* thus assumes that the will is still capable of wanting the good and that the creator helps everyone who at least wants it. The perfection of the divine order is nevertheless not influenced by whether or not people will fall into misery or ascend to happiness; however, God's aid in the latter is conditioned by the human will. The perfect cosmic order is thus not dependent on human efforts, but the intervention of the creator in human destinies is dependent on the human will.

### 3.2. *The Adoption of Men As Sons of God* (De fide et symbolo, De sermone Domini in monte, Enarrationes in Psalmos 1–32, De Genesi imperfectus liber)

During his presbyterate, having asked Bishop Valerius of Hippo for time off to study Scripture,<sup>47</sup> Augustine centred his exegetical concern not only on the letters of the apostle Paul, but also on the exposition of the Psalms, the book of Genesis and the Sermon on the Mount. The biblical universe thus penetrated Augustine's thinking more deeply and motivated his future questions.

<sup>45</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,24,71,240–III,24,72,246: CCL 29, 317f.

<sup>46</sup> ...*parvuli quorum per aetatem nulla peccata sunt ... quamquam nihil recte fecerint, tamen nec peccantes* (*De lib. arb.* III,23,68,229.231: CCL 29, 315). See also *De lib. arb.* III,24,71,242: CCL 29, 317.

<sup>47</sup> See *Ep.* 21, esp. 21,3: CSEL 34/1, 51. The details of Augustine's biblical holiday remain unknown. The conviction of some scholars that Augustine intended to focus on the letters of Paul (e.g. A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 75), is challenged by V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 145, who also summarises previous discussion (145, n. 6).

In his exposition of the first part of the Psalter (*Enarrationes in Psalmos* 1–32),<sup>48</sup> Augustine employs the exegetical method that the speaker of all psalms is Christ, speaking once for himself, once for the church.<sup>49</sup> This approach is grounded in the Pauline doctrine of the “whole Christ”, i.e., the head and the limbs as Christ and the church (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12–27; Eph. 4:15–16).<sup>50</sup> This may explain why, as part of Christ’s body, the believers who have received grace cannot regard their good deeds merely as their own. Their only act is their faith in this grace: that is the act God asks of men.<sup>51</sup> The regime under the law is characterised by the pride in one’s own merits; however, if one takes pride in his own righteousness, he loses it *eo ipso*.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, as we already know, one’s own efforts to acquire righteousness do not lead to the goal: enslaved by desires, men cannot be set free by their acts, but by grace only (*non meritis operum, sed gratia Dei hominem liberari*).<sup>53</sup>

<sup>48</sup> To date this collection is extremely difficult; the individual sermons (some of them preached, some of them dictated) come from various periods and are linked with various occasions, cf. A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches de chronologie augustinienne*, Paris 1965. Arguably, the period of the presbyterate includes the expositions of Pss. 1–32 (their dating fluctuates between 392 and 395), which does not hold for the double sermons, which are of later origin (on the suggestions concerning the dating of individual sermons, see M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus vox totius Christi. Studien zu Augustins Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Freiburg—Basel—Wien 1998, 430–439; P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches de chronologie augustinienne*, Paris 2000, overview 638; idem, “Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat (395–411)”, in: G. Madec, ed., *Augustin prédicateur (395–411)*, Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly 5.-7. 9. 1996, Paris 1998, 218 n. 1). V. Capánaga makes an attempt to systematise Augustine’s doctrine on grace as presented in this work (irrespective of the diachronic aspect; see V. Capánaga, “La doctrina Agustiniiana de la gracia en los Salmos”, in: *StPatr* 6 (= *TU* 81), 1962, 315–349). According to I. Bochet, it is especially the experience of his conversion that Augustine as presbyter reads into Pss. 1–32, preparing his *Confessions* in their expositions (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 159–186). On the interpretation of the whole collection, see M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus*.

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. *Enarr. Psalm.* 3,9: CSEL 93/1A, 89; *Enarr. Psalm.* 17,51: CSEL 93/1A, 293. See M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus*, 234–378, who shows the individual varieties of Augustine’s exposition of the Psalms as *vox ad Christum*, *vox de Christo*, *vox de ecclesia*, *vox Christi*, *vox Christi ex persona nostra*, *vox ecclesiae*, and often explicitly as *vox totius Christi* (this idea, which already appears in the expositions of Pss. 1–32, goes on to gain prominence in later expositions, see *ibid.* 372).

<sup>50</sup> See e.g. *Enarr. Psalm.* 3,9: CSEL 93/1A, 89; *Enarr. Psalm.* 17,2: CSEL 93/1A, 269.

<sup>51</sup> ... *cum in ipsa fide sint omnia opera, quae diligit Deus* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 32,4: CSEL 93/1A, 403).

<sup>52</sup> The warning against taking inappropriate pride in one’s acts is among Augustine’s favourite themes; in this regard, Augustine quotes the lines of 1 Cor. 4:7 (“What do you have that you did not receive?”) and 1 Cor. 1:31 (“He who glories, let him glory in the Lord.”), see e.g. *Enarr. Psalm.* 3,3: CSEL 93/1A, 83; *Enarr. Psalm.* 23,10: CSEL 93/1A, 341–343. From the exposition of the Psalms onwards, these lines play an important role in his doctrine of grace (see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 82–84).

<sup>53</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 31,1: CSEL 93/1A, 399. See also *Enarr. Psalm.* 23,2: CSEL 93/1A, 337: ... *eccle-*

The appropriate human response is to love its giver *gratis*, i.e., not out of desire for a reward, but for his sake alone.<sup>54</sup> In the regime of grace it is thus not the mechanism of merit and reward that prevails; instead, it is God's love, which has no reason but itself and which asks this very love of men who became part of the body of Christ.

Apart from the idea of the "whole Christ" and the inclusion of people in his body, Augustine employs another Pauline image in several of his works from the presbyterate; one which expresses the connection of the believers with Christ, and, through him, with God: the adoption of people as sons of God and joint heirs with Christ (cf. Rom. 8:17; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5). In accord with the Greek Fathers, Augustine differentiates the "adoptive sonship" of the believers as "being born into the grace of God" (*in Dei gratiam renascuntur per adoptionem filiorum*) from the "natural sonship" of Christ as the cause of the adoptive sonship, in the way the light is the cause of illumination.<sup>55</sup> On the basis of the adoption, the believers are endowed with participation in divinity (see Ps. 81[82]:6), without being identical to God by nature (*naturaliter*).<sup>56</sup> By this gift, or the Holy Spirit as the love poured out into human hearts (Rom. 5:5), the believers "undergo renewal (*regeneratio*) according to Christ" (here Augustine probably means baptismal renewal) and they can call God their Father.<sup>57</sup>

The filial adoption through "spiritual renewal" (*regeneratio spiritualis*) is in Augustine's opinion God's gift (*beneficium*) following the gift of creation. Man is given the "power to become a son of God" and "coheir with Christ", i.e., inherit eternal life. The condition of the adoption, according to Augustine's exposition of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, is to follow the "natural" Son of God by fulfilling his commandment:

---

*sia, quae devictis per domini gratiam cupiditatibus saecularibus ad recipiendam immortalitatem caritate parata est. Enarr. Psalm. 31(2),1: CCL 38, 224: ... gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeveniente nos misericordia domini Dei nostri.*

<sup>54</sup> *Quaesivi non a te aliquod extra te praemium, ... sed vultum tuum, domine, requiram, ut gratis te diligam (Enarr. Psalm. 26,8: CSEL 93/1A, 363).*

<sup>55</sup> See *De fide et symb.* 4,6: BA 9<sup>2</sup>, 32. Cf. also e.g. *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 67,2: CCL 44A, 166.

<sup>56</sup> See *De fide et symb.* 9,16: BA 9<sup>2</sup>, 48. Augustine is familiar with the idea of the deification of man by his participation in Christ, close to the theology of the Greek Fathers; see also below, chap. I.3,3d. On the whole theme, see G. Bonner, "Augustine's Conception of Deification", in: *JThS*, N.S., 37 (1986), 369–386, reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (N° 1).

<sup>57</sup> *De fide et symb.* 9,19: BA 9<sup>2</sup>, 56–60.

There is but one Son by nature, who knows nothing at all of sin; but we are made sons, by the power that we receive (*potestate accepta*), in so far as we carry out what He prescribes. ... We, therefore, become sons of God by a spiritual rebirth and are adopted into the kingdom of God not as though we were strangers, but as made and created by Him. Thus there is the one kindness (*beneficium*), His having created us by His almighty power when before we were nothing; and the other, whereby He adopted us that as sons we might enjoy with Him eternal life to the measure of our participation (*pro nostra participatione*). Hence He did not say: "Do these things *because* (*quia*) you are children"; but: "Do these things *in order that* (*ut*) you may be children" (cf. Matt. 5:45).<sup>58</sup>

In another passage of the same work Augustine holds that nobody has deserved the inheritance by their deeds, but it was given to us by God's grace (*non est meritum nostrorum sed gratiae Dei*): "the fact that we are called to an eternal inheritance to be coheirs with Christ and come into the adoption of sons is not owing to any merit of ours, but to the grace of God."<sup>59</sup>

The relationship to God as the Father, also expressed in the "Our Father" prayer Augustine comments on, establishes at the same time brotherhood among people.<sup>60</sup> The grace of the Holy Spirit bestowing adoptive sonship is "common grace" (*gratia communis*), which makes it possible to enter "the fellowship of the holy brotherhood" (*societas sanctae fraternitatis*). Sinning against brotherly love after one has accepted the grace (*post acceptam gratiam*: in other words, after baptism<sup>61</sup>), means offending against the Holy Spirit.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> *Unus enim naturaliter filius est, qui nescit omnino peccare; nos autem potestate accepta efficitur filii, in quantum ea quae ab illo praecipuntur implemus. ... Filii ergo efficitur regeneratione spiritali et adoptamur in regnum Dei, non tamquam alieni sed tamquam ab illo facti et creati, hoc est conditi, ut unum sit beneficium quo nos fecit esse per omnipotentiam suam, cum ante nihil essemus, alterum quo adoptavit, ut cum eo tamquam filii vita aeterna pro nostra participatione fruere-mur. Itaque non ait: Facite ista, quia estis filii, sed: Facite ista, ut sitis filii* (*De serm. Dom. 1,23,78: CCL 35, 87 f.*). English translation after J.J. Jepson, 89.

<sup>59</sup> ... *quod vocamur ad aeternam haereditatem, ut simus Christi coheredes et in adoptionem filiorum veniamus, non est meritum nostrorum sed gratiae Dei* (*De serm. Dom. II,4,16: CCL 35, 106*). English translation by J.J. Jepson, 105.

<sup>60</sup> *De serm. Dom. II,4,16: CCL 35, 107.*

<sup>61</sup> See *De serm. Dom. 1,22,75: CCL 35, 84,1831; 85,1846 f.* In light of these passages, V.H. Drecoll infers that "grace" is regarded here as the "state" of the believer after baptism (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 149 f.).

<sup>62</sup> *De serm. Dom. 1,22,73: CCL 35, 83.*

To become a son of God (cf. Matt. 5:9) is, according to Augustine's exposition, to acquire "likeness to God" (*Dei similitudo*), to be made "in his image" (*ad imaginem Dei*) through (baptismal) renewal.<sup>63</sup> However, this is possible only through Christ, who is the "first likeness" of God (*prima similitudo*) and the basis of every possible likeness of man to God.<sup>64</sup>

### 3.3. Augustine's Expositions of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians

Augustine's biblical concern during his presbyterate culminates in his expositions of the letters of Paul.<sup>65</sup> To the most comprehensive work by the apostle, the Epistle to the Romans, he returned more than once: *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos* is a collection of exegetical issues centred mainly on Rom. 7–9; similarly, in the collection of partial questions *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, several issues are focused on the exposition of the aforementioned passages. Augustine also sought to work out a comprehensive commentary on this letter, yet he did not get beyond the line in Rom. 1:7; therefore, the work is called *Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio*. Finally, he was concerned with Paul's doctrine on grace in the comprehensive exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. In all of these works, dated between 394 and 395, it is possible to find themes similar to those appearing in the other works from his presbyterate, though

<sup>63</sup> See *De serm. Dom.* I.4,12: CCL 35, 11 f.

<sup>64</sup> See *De Gen. litt. imp.* 16: CSEL 28/1, 497–499. Augustine makes it clear that the "image" (*imago*) refers to the derivative relation of the image to its original, whereas "likeness" (*similitudo*) is the quality on the basis of which the compared things resemble each other. Christ as the "first likeness" does not resemble God by means of participation in another likeness, but he endows people with participation in the relationship of likeness (*ibid.*). However, Augustine rejects the notion of some interpreters that man was created only as an image of the equal Image of God, i.e., the Son. The plural biblical expression "our image" suggests that man is the image of the whole divine Trinity, not just an image of one person (*ibid.*, 501 f.; for more details of this notion, see below, chap. III.2.5a). Augustine is also disinclined to accept the distinction between the original "image" of God in man and his "likeness" in the resurrection, as some of his predecessors maintain, for he regards the likeness as the inherent part of each image (*ibid.* 502 f.; on this distinction, see above, chap. I.2.1).

<sup>65</sup> On Augustine's reading and interpretation of the letters of Paul from the Manichaean period to the Pelagian controversy, see B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, 77–106 (for an overview of the research, see *ibid.* 49–61); T.F. Martin, *Rhetoric and Exegesis in Augustine's Interpretation of Romans 7:24–25a*, Lewiston—Queenston—Lampeter 2001, 1–35.



now presented in a deeper and more elaborate manner. The sources of his work probably did not include Origen's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (as it was translated into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileia about ten years later)<sup>66</sup> or the commentaries by other Greek Fathers;<sup>67</sup> on the other hand, it cannot be ruled out that he drew from the commentaries written by Marius Victorinus (on the Epistle to the Galatians; his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is unfortunately lost),<sup>68</sup> Ambrosiaster (on the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians) and Jerome (on the Epistle to the Galatians).<sup>69</sup> It seems very likely that he was inspired by the exegetical rules of Tyconius, the "Donatist dissident" (in this context, mention should be made of the third rule concerning the relationship between God's promises and the law<sup>70</sup>). In his exegetical work, Augustine compared various versions of Latin translations, presumably taking into consideration the Greek text on occasion as well.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Cf. B. Altaner, "Augustinus und Origenes", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967 (= TU 83), 224–252; C.P. Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbrief-text des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*, Freiburg 1985, 45. In another study the author argues that Augustine probably read this translation as late as 411; see C.P. Bammel, Augustine, "Origen and the Exegesis of St. Paul", in: *Augustinianum*, 32, 1992, 342 and 358–361.

<sup>67</sup> See B. Altaner, "Augustinus und die griechische Sprache", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 149; idem, "Die Benützung von original griechischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus", *ibid.* 156.

<sup>68</sup> This is the opinion of A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 118; recently also N. Cipriani, "Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino", in: *Augustinianum*, 38, 1998, 413–428. Other scholars are rather sceptical as far as Augustine's employment of Victorinus' commentaries is concerned; see A.A. Bastiaensen, "Augustin commentateur de saint Paul et l'Ambrosiaster", in: *SE* 36, 1996, 37–65; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 171, n. 82.

<sup>69</sup> This is maintained by A.A. Bastiaensen, "Augustin commentateur". Other scholars are rather sceptical with respect to Augustine's familiarity with these commentaries (see A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 118–126; Ph. Platz, *Der Römerbrief in der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Würzburg 1937, 41–53; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 146).

<sup>70</sup> Augustine will later paraphrase the rule as follows: "works were given us by God as the reward of faith" (*opera nobis ... a Deo dari merito fidei*) (*De doctr. Christ.* III,33,46: CCL 32, 105 f.). On its employment in Augustine's expositions of the letters of Paul, see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 85 f.; further literature is given in J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 50 n. 33; 147 n. 10.

<sup>71</sup> See J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 50 n. 34. D. de Bruyne even presumed that Augustine had been working on his own revision of the Latin biblical text according to the Greek version, see D. de Bruyne, *Les Fragments de Freising* (*épîtres de S. Paul et épîtres catholiques*), Roma 1921, esp. XXXVII f.; idem, "Saint Augustin, reviseur de la Bible", in: *Miscellanea Agostiniana. Testi e studi pubblicati a cura dell'ordine eremitano di S. Agostino nel XV centenario dalla morte del santo dottore*, II, 1931, 523–544 (similarly Ph. Platz, *Der Römerbrief*, 38 f.). This hypothesis has nevertheless been abandoned; see B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, 111 ff.

## 3.3a. Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos

Judging from Augustine's collection of questions, the main purport of the Epistle to the Romans is the relationship between the regimes under the law and under grace (*opera legis et gratiae*).<sup>72</sup> While the law cannot overcome the unpropitious enslaving desire (*concupiscentia, desideria carnalia*), multiplying it by its prohibitions instead,<sup>73</sup> grace actually removes sin, for it forgives it on one hand and gives men the power to overcome it on the other.<sup>74</sup> The freedom of the will, limited in its efficacy by the burden of Adam's sin, is in fact not the freedom of not sinning, but only of not wanting to sin (*peccare nolle*). Men are not able to realise their wanting (cf. Rom. 7:15–23); only grace gives the will its efficacy:

For free will existed perfectly in the first man; we, however, prior to grace, do not have free will so as not to sin, but only so much that we do not want to sin. But with grace, not only do we want to act rightly, but we can; not by our own strength, but by the help of the Liberator. And at the resurrection he will bring us that perfect peace which follows from good will. For *Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will* (Luke 2:14).<sup>75</sup>

Grace thus endows men with the power to act rightly, inspiring them through the Holy Spirit with the love of God:

Therefore the good works we do once we have received grace are due not to ourselves, but to him who justified us by grace.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>72</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom., praef.*: CSEL 84, 3. As C.P. Bammel points out, what Augustine pins down as the main theme is radically different from Origen's perception; according to Origen, the main theme of the epistle is the relationship between the Jews and Gentiles (see C.P. Bammel, "Augustine", 351 ff.). On Augustine's exposition of Paul's theology in this work, see M.G. Mara, "L'influsso di Paolo in Agostino", in: J. Ries et al., *Le Epistole Paoline*, 125–162; I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 209–216.

<sup>73</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 29,37: CSEL 84, 16; *Expos. prop. Rom.* 44,52,4: CSEL 84, 24.

<sup>74</sup> *Venit ergo gratia, quae donet peccata praeterita et conantem adiuuet et tribuat caritatem iustitiae et auferat metum* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 12,7: CSEL 84, 7).

<sup>75</sup> *Liberum ergo arbitrium perfecte fuit in primo homine, in nobis autem ante gratiam non est liberum arbitrium, ut non peccemus, sed tantum ut peccare nolumus. Gratia vero efficit, ut non tantum velimus recte facere, sed etiam possimus, non viribus nostris, sed liberatoris auxilio, qui nobis etiam perfectam pacem in resurrectione tribuet, quae pax perfecta bonam voluntatem consequitur. Gloria enim in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 12,12: CSEL 84, 8 f.). English translation by P. Fredriksen Landes, 7.

<sup>76</sup> *Quod ergo bene operamur iam accepta gratia, non nobis sed illi tribuendum est, qui per gratiam nos iustificavit* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 15,21,2: CSEL 84, 9). English translation by P. Fredriksen Landes, 9.

[Paul] shows us that all those things which we might attribute to ourselves ought to be attributed to God, who deigned to give us grace through the Holy Spirit.<sup>77</sup>

The spirit of slavery, typical of the condition under the law, is then replaced by the “the Spirit of adoption” (Rom. 8:15–16);<sup>78</sup> man becomes “spiritual”,<sup>79</sup> “dies to sin” (Rom. 6:2),<sup>80</sup> and out of love, he is able to fulfil the requirements of the law, which fear was not able to fulfil.<sup>81</sup> So, men do not earn justice by their deeds (i.e., their aim to fulfil the law), but because they have believed in grace (and out of love, they now fulfil the law).<sup>82</sup> Such is Augustine’s exposition of Paul’s doctrine on justification by faith, according to which faith is actually the relevant human merit (*meritum fidei*) and the ground of all other merits (*fides inchoat meritum*):

*Therefore it depends not on man’s willing or running, but on God’s mercy* (Rom. 9:16). Paul does not take away the free choice of the will, but says our will does not suffice unless God helps us, making us merciful so that we can do good works through the gift of the Holy Spirit ... For as with the chosen—not works but faith initiating merit so that through the gift of God they do good—, so with the condemned: infidelity and impiety initiate their meriting their penalty. Thus because of the punishment itself they do evil ... But that mercy was given to the preceding merit of faith, and that hardening to preceding impiety, so that we work both good deeds through the gift of God and evil through his chastisement. Nevertheless, man’s free choice of the will remains, whether for belief in God so that mercy follows, or for impiety followed by punishment.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>77</sup> ... *monstrat illa omnia, quae possemus nobis tribuere, Deo esse tribuenda, qui per spiritum sanctum gratiam dare dignatus est* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 20,26: CSEL 84, 10). English translation after P. Fredriksen Landes, 9.

<sup>78</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 44,52: CSEL 84, 24 f.

<sup>79</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 34,41: CSEL 84, 18.

<sup>80</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 25,31: CSEL 84, 13.

<sup>81</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 37,44,3: CSEL 84, 19; *Expos. prop. Rom.* 37,45–46,4: CSEL 84, 20.

<sup>82</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 13,19–14,20: CSEL 84, 9.

<sup>83</sup> *Quod autem ait: Igitur non volentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est Dei, non tollit liberum voluntatis arbitrium, sed non sufficere dicit velle nostrum, nisi adiuvet Deus misericordes nos efficiendo ad bene operandum per donum spiritus sancti. ... Sicut enim in his, quos elegit Deus, non opera sed fides inchoat meritum, ut per munus Dei bene operentur, sic in his, quos damnat, infidelitas et impietas inchoat poenae meritum, ut per ipsam poenam etiam male operentur. ... Sed et illa misericordia praecedenti merito fidei tribuitur et ista obduratio praecedenti impietati, ut et bona per donum Dei operemur et mala per supplicium, cum tamen homini non auferatur liberum voluntatis arbitrium, sive ad credendum Deo, ut consequatur nos misericordia, sive ad impietatem, ut consequatur supplicium* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 54,62,1–12: CSEL 84, 36–38). English translation after P. Fredriksen Landes, 35.

It is in light of this outlook on faith that Augustine comments on Paul's account of the lot of the Old Testament brothers, Esau and Jacob, which had been decided by God before they were born (cf. Rom. 9:10–13). According to Augustine's exposition at this point, God did not cancel the free choice of their wills, he only foreknew their deeds (*praesciebat*), or rather, not their deeds—for the apostle maintains that nobody can be saved on account of their deeds—but their faith. Only they who believe will be endowed by God with the gift of his Spirit, whose love enables them to act rightly. God foreknew to whom, on the grounds of their faith, he would give his Spirit so that they could act rightly; however, God is not the cause of their faith: "That we believe is ours, but the good we work is His" (*Quod credimus, nostrum est, quod autem bonum operamur, illius*):

Therefore God did not elect anyone's works, which God himself will grant, by foreknowledge, but rather by foreknowledge he chose faith, so that he chooses precisely him whom he foreknew would believe in him; and to him he gives the Holy Spirit, so that by doing good works he will as well attain eternal life. For the same Apostle says: *It is the same God who works all things in all* (1 Cor. 12:6). Nowhere is it said, "God believes all things in all". Belief is our work, but good deeds are his who gives the Holy Spirit to believers.<sup>84</sup>

Even after Adam's unpropitious transgression, men can still exercise their will, allowing them to believe or not to believe,<sup>85</sup> though their will can no longer fulfil the intention of a good act and must be aided with the gift of the Holy Spirit. However, it is not possible to even want (i.e., in this case, to believe<sup>86</sup>), Augustine argues, unless we have been called.<sup>87</sup>

But does the calling, which precedes the human will (faith), not cancel human freedom—and human responsibility—after all? In order to confute such a suspicion, Augustine explains that a calling (*vocatio*) is given to "many" (see Matt. 22:14), but it is only through their free faith that men

---

<sup>84</sup> *Non ergo elegit Deus opera cuiusquam in praescientia, quae ipse daturus est, sed fidem elegit in praescientia, ut quem sibi crediturum esse praescivit ipsum elegerit, cui spiritum sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam aeternam vitam consequeretur. Dicit enim idem apostolus: Idem Deus, qui operatur omnia in omnibus, nusquam autem dictum est: Deus credit omnia in omnibus. Quod ergo credimus, nostrum est, quod autem bonum operamur, illius, qui credentibus in se dat spiritum sanctum* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 52,60,11–12: CSEL 84, 34f.). English translation after P. Fredriksen Landes, 33.

<sup>85</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 54,62,13: CSEL 84, 38.

<sup>86</sup> The nature of faith as a purely voluntary act is pointed out by A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 55.

<sup>87</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 54,62,3: CSEL 84, 36.

are given justification (*iustificatio*), by virtue of which they can become the elect (*electio*). Only with such human beings is the intention of God's original calling fulfilled. Consequently, there exist a general call and a call which will "fulfil God's intention" (*vocatio secundum propositum*).<sup>88</sup> With whom God's calling will be realised in this fortunate way depends on human decision itself; God does not choose them although he foreknows them. God's predestination (*praedestinatio*) corresponds to his foreknowledge (*praescientia*):<sup>89</sup>

For not all who are called are called according to the purpose, for that purpose pertains to the foreknowledge and predestination of God. Nor did God predestine anyone except him whom he knew would believe and would follow the call. Such persons Paul designates "the elect".<sup>90</sup>

This idea is exemplified by a negative example, namely the exposition of the Old Testament account of how God "hardened the heart" of the Egyptian pharaoh (Exod. 10:1). God did not force the pharaoh to do his perverted deeds; he only left him to his own perversity in order to punish his unbelief. Even here, the crucial point was human faith, or rather, unfaithfulness, not predetermined by God, yet foreknown.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> *Propositum* from the apostle's text is in Augustine's view the intention of God, not the intention of the man concerned, which is, in comparison with his predecessors, by no means commonplace (see A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 42 incl. n. 6).

<sup>89</sup> According to K. Janssen, Augustine's conception of God's foreknowledge and predestination in this form is very close to his older notion of divine providence (*providentia*): God guarantees that the order of justice is maintained in the area of human action as well (K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 116). The twofold "calling" is characterised by A. Niebergall as *vocatio universalis* and *vocatio particularis* (i.e., *secundum propositum*); he also observes that the "universal calling" has adopted the place previously occupied by *admonitio* (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 96f.). This predestination model is described by V.H. Drecoll as a model of "temporal anteriority" ("der zeitlichen Vorordnung"): God *foreknows* the faith of the man in question; his calling comes *before* faith (V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 165–171).

<sup>90</sup> *Non enim omnes, qui vocati sunt, secundum propositum vocati sunt, hoc enim propositum ad praescientiam et ad praedestinationem Dei pertinet. Nec praedestinavit aliquem, nisi quem praescivit crediturum et secuturum vocationem suam, quos et electos dicit* (*Expos. prop. Rom.* 47,55,4: CSEL 84, 30). English translation after P. Fredriksen Landes, 27–29.

<sup>91</sup> See *Expos. prop. Rom.* 54,62,6–8: CSEL 84, 37. In another passage (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,4: CCL 44A, 179f.), Augustine says in the same context that the pharaoh deserved the "hardening of his heart" by his acts, for God cannot be unjust: he always follows human merits, hidden though they may be (*occultissima merita*); see below, chap. 1.3.3b. A. Niebergall refuses to settle for this exposition; in his opinion, divine sovereignty is thus sacrificed to a human notion of justice (A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 112).

## 3.3b. De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII 66–68; 76

In the Pauline numbers of his collection of eighty-three questions, Augustine is also concerned with the relationship between the law and grace according to Rom. 7:1–8:11. The point of departure is the apostle's statement that the law only exposes sin, but it cannot free one from it; this can only be done by grace, which does not abolish the law, but fulfils it.<sup>92</sup> The human struggle with sin (what is meant here is clearly the struggle of an individual, not the periodisation of the history of salvation) is conceived by Augustine in terms of four stages: "before the law" (*ante legem*), when one is not aware of sin, succumbing to one's desires (*concupiscentiae*); "under the law" (*sub lege*), when one tries to struggle with sin, but is overcome by habit (*consuetudo*) and continues to sin; "under grace" (*sub gratia*), when one does not rely on one's power and merits, but turns with love toward the mercy of our deliverer and can thus win; and finally, "in peace" (*in pace*), when all the struggle ends, and one rests in victorious incorruptibility.<sup>93</sup>

The situation "under grace" is closer described along the lines of men fulfilling with their love (*caritas*) the law, which cannot be fulfilled out of fear (*timor*).<sup>94</sup> The situations "under the law" and "under grace" thus turn out to be a twofold regime or a twofold way of relating to the law: on one hand, the aim to fulfil the law determined by fear, failing because of human captivity in sin; on the other, the aim to fulfil the law out of love, not relying on human works, but on mercy. Only the latter can be successful although it still has to overcome the "law of sin" reigning in the "flesh". Despite the fact that the schism in man the apostle describes in Rom. 7:22–25a is typical of the situation "under the law", its traces can also be found in the

<sup>92</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 66,1: CCL 44A, 151f.

<sup>93</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 66,3: CCL 44A, 154f.; similarly, *Expos. prop. Rom.* 12,2–11: CSEL 84, 6–8. A similar exposition can be found in *Enarr. Psalm.* 35,5: CCL 38, 325f., where Augustine describes four ways of fighting against sin, without actually relating them directly to the coming of the law and grace: 1. one does not fight at all, being dragged by sin (*nec pugnare, sed trahi*); 2. one puts up a fight, but he is overcome by sin (*pugnare et vinci*); 3. one fights and overcomes sin (*pugnare et vincere*); 4. one rests in peace and does not have to fight any more (*non pugnare*).

<sup>94</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 66,6: CCL 44A, 158f. The polarity of the law and grace appears for the first time in the work *De utilitate credendi*, in the anti-Manichaean exposition of the line in Gal. 5:4 (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 148): The grace of Christ (*gratia Christi; gratia, id est, beneficium*) frees men from the fear of the law without abolishing the law (*De util. cred.* 3,9: BA 8, 226). The coming of Christ delivers people from fear and brings about love (*De util. cred.* 15,33: BA 8, 288). Here the polarity of the law and grace is predominantly the polarity of fear and love.

new existence “under grace” (see Rom. 7:25b), and it will only be overcome completely in the next life happiness.<sup>95</sup>

There can be little question that Augustine’s concern (undoubtedly also in his polemic against the Manichaean rejection of the law) is not to abolish or overcome the law, but to fulfil it in a more efficacious way than a regime of fear. What men were not able to achieve by themselves and on their own merits in their efforts to earn righteousness, they will achieve by believing in God’s grace preceding their faith. Faith thus becomes the only relevant human merit (*credendo meritum comparatur*):

For the reward of knowledge is paid to the deserving, and such merit is obtained by believing. However, the very grace which is given through faith is given prior to any merit that we might have.<sup>96</sup>

Yet it would be foolish to perceive the acts performed on account of faith in God’s grace as being in opposition to faith itself. This problem, known to Augustine as the New Testament discrepancy between Paul and James, is necessarily an imaginary one. Human deeds cannot bring about salvation on their own; yet they who have believed in salvation by grace will surely, on account of this faith, perform good deeds as an inherent part of faith.

---

<sup>95</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 66,5–6: *CCL* 44A, 155–162. The exposition of the lines in Rom. 7:22–25a as the condition of a human being “under the law” will be abandoned later for the view that the situation of the split of the will is described by the apostle as his own experience, i.e., as a situation of a man “under grace” (moreover, one endowed with exceptional holiness), who nevertheless keeps struggling with the consequences of the inherited burden of Adam’s sin. The new interpretation probably appears as a reaction to Pelagius’ exposition in Augustine’s sermons (see below, chap. III.2.4; cf. J. Lössl, “Introduction”, in: *CCL* 41Ba, XLVI–XLVIII); and in *De nupt.* I,27,30–31,36 (see below, chap. III.3.1; III.2.8 n. 347; cf. H. Jonas, *Augustin und das paulinische Freiheitsproblem. Ein philosophischer Beitrag zur Genesis der christlichen Freiheitslehre*, Göttingen 1930, 22–44; O. Brandenhewer, “Augustinus über Röm. 7,14 ff.”, in: *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, II, 879–883); it is already implied in Augustine’s first anti-Pelagian work *De pecc. mer.* II,12,17 (see R. Dodaro, “*Ego miser homo*. Augustine, the Pelagian Controversy, and the Paul of Romans 7:7–25”, in: *Augustinianum*, 44, 2004, 135–144; on this work, see below, chap. III.1.1), or even earlier (see F. Van Fleteren, “Augustine’s Evolving Exegesis of Romans 7: 22–23 in its Pauline Context”, in: *Augustinian Studies*, 32/1, 2001, 89–114). The development of Augustine’s exegesis until his new position is traced by M.-F. Berrouard, “Exégèse augustinienne de Rom. 7,7–25 entre 396 et 418 avec les remarques sur les deux premières périodes de la crise «pélagienne»”, in: *RechAug* 16, 1981, 101–195. For sermons from Augustine’s episcopate before the Pelagian controversy, see P.-M. Hombert, “Augustin”, 226 f. Augustine’s earlier exegesis until the redaction of the *Confessions* is analysed by I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 186–228. Augustine’s exposition of this passage across the whole of his work with respect to its rhetorical employment is discussed by T.F. Martin, *Rhetoric*.

<sup>96</sup> *Merces enim cognitionis meritis redditur; credendo autem meritum comparatur. Ipsa autem gratia, quae data est per fidem, nullis nostris meritis praecedentibus data est* (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,3: *CCL* 44A, 177 f.). English translation by D.L. Mosher, 161.

Such deeds must nevertheless be attributed to grace, not to one's own efforts.<sup>97</sup>

The efficacy of grace can, in Augustine's opinion, also be described as a new forming of a believer in the image of the "heavenly man". This is the "fullest grace" (*plenissima gratia*), by which men become the sons of God. Augustine holds that men have lost their form imposed by God and have fallen to the earth from which they were formed,<sup>98</sup> becoming thus a mass of "mud" or "clay" (*massa luti*), as the apostle in Rom. 9:21 calls it; i.e., a "mass of sin" (*massa peccati*):

Therefore, given that our nature sinned in paradise, we are [now] formed through a mortal begetting by the same Divine Providence, not according to heaven, but according to earth, i.e., not according to the spirit, but according to the flesh, and we have all become one mass of clay, i.e., a mass of sin.<sup>99</sup>

This passage makes it possible to argue that in addition to the potter metaphor in Rom. 9, the origin of Augustine's outlook on mankind as the "mass of the damned" as presented in his later doctrine of grace is probably also related to the hylomorphic notion of forming from unformed matter which reappears in his expositions of creation.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 76: CCL 44A, 218–221. Similarly *Enarr. Psalm. 31*(2),3–4: CCL 38, 226 f.; *Enarr. Psalm. 31*(2),6: CCL 38, 229; *Enarr. Psalm. 31*(2),7–9: CCL 38, 231.

<sup>98</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,2: CCL 44A, 176.

<sup>99</sup> *Ex quo ergo in paradiso natura nostra peccavit, ab eadem divina providentia non secundum caelum sed secundum terram, id est non secundum spiritum sed secundum carnem, mortali generatione formamur, et omnes una massa luti facti sumus, quod est massa peccati* (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,3: CCL 44A, 177). English translation by D.L. Mosher, 161. In *Expos. prop. Rom. 54,62,19* (CSEL 84, 39), Augustine also speaks of the man who has not become "spiritual" yet as of *massa luti*. A. Zeoli, who regards this work as older than *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68, notices a certain distinction between the two passages: While *massa luti* rather expresses the difficulty of the human condition which is to be overcome, its interpretation as *massa peccati* represents an important step towards the later *massa damnata*—the image of mankind which has condemned itself to ultimate doom (A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 51–53, 60–63). On the sequence of both texts, see A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 67; the same sequence is argued for by other scholars as well (see Ph. Platz, *Römerbrief*, 23 f., n. 2; K. Flasch, *Logik*, 272; J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 72 and 77 n. 182; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 184 f. incl. n. 99). By contrast, other scholars maintain that *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68 is a little older than Augustine's expositions of the letters of Paul, perhaps a kind of "preliminary work" to them (eg A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 90; similarly, J.P. Burns, *Development*, 30 n. 101; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 85 n. 210). For *massa* or *consparsio*, which later on may even have a positive meaning of *massa purgata* or *massa sanctorum* in Augustine's works, see G. Folliet, "Massa damnata—massa sanctorum chez saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus minister et magister. Homenaje al prof. A. Turrado Turrado*, Madrid 1992, 95–109.

<sup>100</sup> For the most illustrative example from the period of Augustine's presbyterate, see *De Gen. litt. imp.* 3–4: CSEL 28/1, 464–468; *De Gen. litt. imp.* 15: CSEL 28/1, 495. A. Niebergall points



It is necessary to break free from this formless state and become a son of God in order to bear God's resemblance again.<sup>101</sup> Now, this is possible only because God himself has grown closer to man in likeness: only in this way can man, who has lost the seal of God's image (*signaculum imaginis*) because of his sin and is now a mere creature, find the "perfect form" of sons of God again.<sup>102</sup> In order to explain the reason why some earn grace and some do not, Augustine appeals to the "deeply hidden merits" (*occultissima merita*), or rather, "something" (*aliquid*) that in the universal situation of human sin (*generale peccatum*) makes some sinners more privileged than the others from the "single mass" and renders them "worthy of justification":

For it springs from deeply hidden merits, because, even though sinners themselves have constituted a single mass on account of the general sin, still it is not the case that there is no difference among them. Therefore, although they have not yet been made righteous, there is some preceding thing in sinners whereby they are rendered worthy of righteousness, and again, there is some preceding thing in other sinners whereby they are deserving of obtuseness.<sup>103</sup>

The difference between both groups apparently depends on their will; the will itself is then made possible by God's calling: "for it is God who works in

---

out the relationship between Augustine's idea of *massa luti* as *massa peccati* and the doctrine of creation (A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 80f.); however, his identification of mud (*lutum*), into which man fell as a result of his wrongdoing, with nothingness (*nihil*) is not grounded in the text. It rather refers to getting closer to "unformed matter" as the notional intermediate stage between nothingness and formed creation. It might be argued that there exists a connection between Augustine's term *massa* and the Manichaean conception of matter as dark sinister mass (ἡ βῶλος), in which divine particles of light are imprisoned (as maintained by E. Buonaiuti, "Manichaeism and Augustine's Idea of *massa perditionis*", in: *HThR* 20, 1927, 117–127). However, other scholars are rather sceptical about this idea (see G. Bonner, *Augustine*, 32). On the Manichaean conception of βῶλος as a mass of an evil substance condemned to doom, see also A. Magris, "Augustins Prädestinationslehre und die manichäischen Quellen", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 153.

<sup>101</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,3: CCL 44A, 177. Augustine's exposition of an unformed mass into which man has fallen because of sin is mainly intended for the encouragement of the readers so that they can ascend from this condition by means of their faith: "do not be mud; become a son of God". Therefore, J. Lössl is not quite justified in using this passage as evidence of the shift of Augustine's thought towards the notion of "grace as the only efficient cause" ("Alleinwirksamkeit der Gnade"), see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 75.

<sup>102</sup> See *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 67,4: CCL 44A, 167 f.

<sup>103</sup> *Venit enim de occultissimis meritis, quia et ipsi peccatores cum propter generale peccatum unam massam fecerint, non tamen nulla est inter illos diversitas. Praecedit ergo aliquid in peccatoribus, quo quamvis nondum sint iustificati, digni efficiantur iustificatione; et item praecedit in aliis peccatoribus, quo digni sint obtusione* (*De div. quaest. LXXXIII*, 68,4: CCL 44A, 180). English translation by D.L. Mosher, 163.

you to will" (cf. Phil. 2:13). It should be pointed out here that the gift of the will, which is going to gain great prominence in his doctrine of grace, is at this point interpreted by Augustine along the lines that nobody could will to come to God unless they were called by God. How men react to this calling is a matter of choice for which only they are responsible, not God:

For it is not enough to will except God shows mercy; but God, who calls to peace, does not show mercy except the will has preceded, because on earth peace is to men of good will (Luke 2:14). And since no one can will unless urged on and called, whether inside where no man sees, or outside through the sound of the spoken word or through some visible signs, it follows that God produces in us even the willing itself (cf. Phil. 2:13). ... Accordingly neither should those who came give themselves the credit, for they came by invitation, nor should those who did not want to come blame it on another, but only on themselves, for they had been invited to come of their free will. Therefore, before merit, the calling determines the will. For this reason, even if someone called takes the credit for coming, he cannot take the credit for being called.<sup>104</sup>

### 3.3c. Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio

In his inchoate commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Augustine enunciates the exposition of the Gospel given by grace as the main aim of the apostle Paul. The good news of salvation is not only meant for the Jews for their merits earned by the fulfilling of the law (*merita operum legis*), but for all people without any previous merits provided they believe in it. It is given by grace; i.e., for free (*gratuito*), not as a repayment of a debt (*debitum*).<sup>105</sup> Therefore, nobody can take pride in their merits: on the contrary, unmerited grace guides one to humility (*disciplina humilitatis*).<sup>106</sup>

<sup>104</sup> *Parum est enim velle nisi Deus misereatur; sed Deus non miseretur, qui ad pacem vocat, nisi voluntas praecesserit, quia in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis. Et quoniam nec velle quisquam potest nisi admonitus et vocatus, sive intrinsecus ubi nullus hominum videt, sive extrinsecus per sermonem sonantem aut aliqua signa visibilia, efficitur ut etiam ipsum velle Deus operetur in nobis. ... Itaque nec illi debent sibi tribuere qui venerunt, quia vocati venerunt, nec illi qui noluerunt venire debent alteri tribuere sed tantum sibi, quoniam ut venirent vocati erant in libera voluntate. Vocatio ergo ante meritum voluntatem operatur. Propterea et si quisquam sibi tribuit quod venit vocatus, non sibi potest tribuere quod vocatus est (De div. quaest. LXXXIII, 68,5; CCL 44A,181).* English translation by D.L. Mosher, 163–165.

<sup>105</sup> See *Expos. Rom. in ch.* 1,1–2: CSEL 84, 145.

<sup>106</sup> See *Expos. Rom. in ch.* 1,4: CSEL 84, 146. According to J.P. Burns, the aim to face potential Jewish pride is one of the topics Augustine was concerned with in his reflections on predestination inspired by Rom. 9 (see J.P. Burns, *Development*, 38).

What Augustine mainly means by grace in this exposition is the forgiveness of sins,<sup>107</sup> one that the accused may obtain from the judge. While granting the apparent wrongdoer pardon is a sign of corruption in human courts,<sup>108</sup> divine justice not only does not prevent, but even demands that he who repents of his transgressions should be forgiven.<sup>109</sup> In this passage, penitence has a meaning similar to the one attributed to faith in the previous accounts. The grace of God's calling (*vocatio*) leads men to penitence, which is the relevant human merit (*poenitentiae meritum*) and on the grounds of which they can obtain the forgiveness of their sins. Divine justice, rightly pursuing the unrepentant ones, thus does not exclude the bestowal of divine grace on the penitents; on the contrary, the grace granted on account of penitence is the "just grace" (*iusta gratia*). At the same time, it is also "gracious justice" (*grata iustitia*), for nobody can obtain it in any other way than by the grace of God's calling, by which their penitence was made possible:

Just, then, is the grace of God, and gracious is his justice. And here too grace precedes the merit of repentance, so that no one can repent his own sin unless he is first admonished by God's call.<sup>110</sup>

"Grace" is thus both God's call to penitence and the very forgiveness on account of the "merit of repentance".

According to the introductory greeting from Rom. 1:7 ("Grace to you and peace"), the grace of forgiveness of sins is accompanied by reconciliation with God in the Holy Spirit, whose gift men accept.<sup>111</sup> Despising this grace

<sup>107</sup> See *Expos. Rom. inch.* 8,4: CSEL 84, 155. As K. Janssen remarks, the conception of grace as the forgiveness of sins is quite exceptional. Augustine perceives grace mostly as help in weakness or recovery from illness (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 119ff.). This argument, based on Harnack's analyses (see A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III, Tübingen 1910<sup>4</sup>, 87), is challenged by V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 174 incl. n. 87.

<sup>108</sup> See *Expos. Rom. inch.* 8,4,2: CSEL 84, 155. Therefore, the expression *gratia* is in the legal language in Augustine's time a very pejorative term referring to the obstruction of justice as a result of corruption; see J.N.L. Myres, "Pelagius and the End of Roman Rule in Britain", in: *JRS* 50, 1960, 24–26.

<sup>109</sup> See *Expos. Rom. inch.* 9,1–2: CSEL 84, 156. This new conception of justice as the forgiveness of sins is highly regarded by A. Niebergall, though he considers it as not quite elaborate yet: divine justice is still dependent on human acts (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 85ff., 108).

<sup>110</sup> *Iusta est ergo gratia Dei et grata iustitia, cum in eo quoque etiam poenitentiae meritum gratia praecedat, quod neminem peccati sui poeniteret nisi admonitione aliqua vocationis Dei* (*Expos. Rom. inch.* 9,6: CSEL 84, 156). English translation after P. Fredriksen Landes, 63. On the role of the confession of sins as the beginning of justification in Augustine and the possibility of its inspiration by Ambrose's conception, see A. Fitzgerald, "Ambrose and Augustine: *Confessio* as *Initium Iustitiae*", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 173–185.

<sup>111</sup> See *Expos. Rom. inch.* 8,4–5: CSEL 84, 155; *Expos. Rom. inch.* 11,1–2: CSEL 84, 159.

and reconciliation means blasphemy against the Spirit as mentioned in the Gospel (Mark 3:29 parr.): either by the erroneous illusion of one's own righteousness, or by persisting in sin. In either case, the unpardonable sin consists in the unwillingness to repent, while penitence is the way to reconciliation.<sup>112</sup>

### 3.3d. Epistolae ad Galatas expositionis liber unus<sup>113</sup>

It is again the contrast between humility awakened by grace and the pride of one's merits related to the fulfilment of the law on which Augustine focuses in his exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. If it were possible to achieve righteousness by fulfilling the law, Augustine argues, human pride would be legitimate, and the coming of Christ would not even be necessary.<sup>114</sup> On the contrary, the path of grace offered through him is the path of humility:<sup>115</sup> by the deeds of the law nobody can be justified (particularly not by ritual deeds), but only by faith<sup>116</sup> which worships God *gratis*, for his own sake, not in the pursuit of earning something, and without fear of losing something.<sup>117</sup>

In the way Augustine distinguishes between the regimes under grace ("to live from faith") and under the law ("to live in the deeds of the law"),<sup>118</sup> a new tone appears, one that was not present in the expositions of the Epistle to the Romans: the real fruit of grace is now represented by the attitude of faith,<sup>119</sup> overcoming the mechanism of merits, boasting and reward. This attitude is also called "humility" by Augustine.<sup>120</sup> It is a situation of freedom (Gal. 5:13), too, in which man does not fulfil the commands out of fear, but out of love;<sup>121</sup> for this is the only way of accomplishing the law: renouncing ritual deeds (*sacramenta*) as superfluous and filling the moral commands of

<sup>112</sup> See *Expos. Rom. inch.* 22,3: CSEL 84, 177; *Expos. Rom. inch.* 23,7: CSEL 84, 179.

<sup>113</sup> The commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians can arguably be dated between both expositions of the Epistle to the Romans (see *Retract.* I,23–25: CCL 57, 66–74).

<sup>114</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 4,3: CSEL 84, 59; *Expos. Gal.* 16,6–7: CSEL 84, 72.

<sup>115</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 15,11–17: CSEL 84, 70 f.

<sup>116</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 19,1–5: CSEL 84, 76.

<sup>117</sup> *Ille autem iustificatur apud Deum, qui eum gratis colit, non scilicet cupiditate appetendi aliquid ab ipso praeter ipsum aut timore amittendi* (*Expos. Gal.* 21,2: CSEL 84, 79 f.).

<sup>118</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 21: CSEL 84, 79 f.

<sup>119</sup> As V.H. Drecoll points out, the collocation *gratia fidei* gains great prominence in *Expos. Gal.* (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 186 f.).

<sup>120</sup> That is why Augustine remarks that only humility can fulfil the law (*Expos. Gal.* 24,14: CSEL 84, 88).

<sup>121</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 43,3: CSEL 84, 116 f.; *Expos. Gal.* 43,7–8: CSEL 84, 117.

the law (*mores*) with the love of one's neighbour (Gal. 5:11–14).<sup>122</sup> In Augustine's opinion, such love has the same freely given character as reverence for God; in other words, it does not seek reward and punishment, but righteousness itself:

Not to kill another human being in order not to be killed oneself, does not fulfil the command of righteousness; what does fulfil it is not to kill another human being because it is unrighteous, even if one could get away with it (*impune*) not only with other people but even with God.<sup>123</sup>

Also new in the commentary on Galatians is the emphasis on Christ as the mediator between man and God, who, because of his humility—consisting of his renunciation of his equality to God (Phil. 2:6)—is a model of this attitude. Divinity came down in humility to mankind so that men—also because of their humility—could be elevated to divinity. Still, the elevation cannot be attributed to human merits, but to grace, which is to be returned and imitated with love:

Thus, through revelation before Christ humbled himself and through the gospel afterwards, all who by believing loved and by loving imitated Christ's humility were cured of the impiety of pride in order to be reconciled to God. But because this righteousness of faith was not given to human beings on account of merit but on account of God's mercy and grace, it was not generally available (*popularis*) before the Lord was born as a human being among human beings.<sup>124</sup>

In the imitation of Christ's humility,<sup>125</sup> man “puts on Christ” (Gal. 3:27) and becomes his brother and a son of God, not by nature (*natura, naturaliter*), but by participation (*participatione*) in Christ.<sup>126</sup> Christ, “the only begotten (*unigenitus*) of the Father” (John 1:14), becomes in his incarnation “the firstborn (*primogenitus*) among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29) as well, for by his participation in human nature, men in turn get to participate in him and

<sup>122</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 44,1–3: CSEL 84, 118.

<sup>123</sup> *Quia et hominem si propterea non occidit aliquis, ne et ipse occidatur, non implet praeceptum iustitiae, sed si ideo non occidit, quia iniustum est, etiam si id possit facere impune, non solum apud homines, sed etiam apud Deum* (*Expos. Gal.* 43,4: CSEL 84, 117). English translation by E. Plumer, 205.

<sup>124</sup> *Sanati sunt ergo ab impietate superbiae, ut reconciliarentur Deo, quicumque homines humilitatem Christi et per revelationem, antequam fieret, et per evangelium, posteaquam facta est, credendo dilexerunt, diligendo imitati sunt. Sed haec iustitia fidei, quia non pro merito data est hominibus, sed pro misericordia et gratia Dei, non erat popularis, antequam dominus homo inter homines nasceretur* (*Expos. Gal.* 24,10–11: CSEL 84, 87). English translation by E. Plumer, 167.

<sup>125</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 25,9–10: CSEL 84, 90.

<sup>126</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 27,3–4: CSEL 84, 92.

become sons of God.<sup>127</sup> Men can thus call God “Abba, Father” (Gal. 4:6)—the bilingual way of addressing suggests, according to Augustine’s exposition, that the adoption as sons relates to both Jews and Gentiles.<sup>128</sup>

The human participation in Christ is also described by Augustine as “the life of Christ” (cf. Gal. 2:20)<sup>129</sup> or the “forming” of Christ in man (cf. Gal. 4:19), meaning that man “cleaves to Christ by spiritual love” (*adhaeret Christo dilectione spirituali*).<sup>130</sup> Man thus becomes “a new creature”; i.e., more than a mere creature and more than a mere human being (*non homines*).<sup>131</sup>

\*\*\*

In the works from the period of his presbyterate, significantly influenced by the reading of the letters of the apostle Paul, Augustine modified his notion of the efficacy of human will.<sup>132</sup> The burden of Adam’s sin notwithstanding, men have the freedom of will, which enables them to take their destiny into their own hands; however, their will, because of the unpropitious situation men are born into and under the influence of enslaving habit men have developed by their previous decisions, is not strong enough to fulfil the good intention.<sup>133</sup> The aim to fulfil the divine law on one’s own fails, and men

<sup>127</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 30,10: CSEL 84, 96. Similarly, *Expos. prop. Rom.* 48,56: CSEL 84, 30 f.

<sup>128</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 31,2: CSEL 84, 97.

<sup>129</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 17,6–10: CSEL 84, 74.

<sup>130</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 38,3–4: CSEL 84, 106 f.

<sup>131</sup> See *Expos. Gal.* 63,5–7: CSEL 84, 139 f. G. Bonner points out (referring to these passages in *Expos. Gal.* and others from later works) that the participation of man in divinity is thus mediated by the incarnation of Christ (see G. Bonner, “Augustine’s Conception of Deification”).

<sup>132</sup> K. Janssen evaluates Augustine’s development through the prism of his conception of the will, distinguishing in the period of Augustine’s presbyterate three stages before his later doctrine: In the first works, there is no marked difference with respect to the period before the ordination (*De util. cred.*, *De duabus anim.*), while in the polemic with Fortunatus and in the exposition of the Sermon on the Mount there is already a shift related to the influence of “habit” on the will. The will deprived of its efficacy is then introduced especially in Augustine’s expositions of the letters of Paul, though it already appears in certain passages of *De lib. arb.* III (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, see 99–130).

<sup>133</sup> A. Niebergall regards as the “advancement” of this period of Augustine’s thought his deeper view of sin as a “constant urge to sin”, which plays an important role in the development of Augustine’s doctrine of grace (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 79 and 125 f.). For his part, K. Janssen emphasises the newly discovered significance of “history” present in the form of the burden of Adam’s sin: human sin is thus brought out of the isolation of an individual voluntary act (see K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 107). On the other hand, V.H. Drecoll is disinclined to accept the idea that Augustine’s doctrine of grace is a mere consequence of his conception of sin; he considers Augustine’s reflections on the limited freedom of the will leading to the conception of the “fall” and its consequences as a “competing model” to his description of the condition of man “under the law” from the expositions of the letters

become the slaves of their failure and fear. To act rightly, in correspondence with the requirements of the law, is possible only with God's help;<sup>134</sup> or, more precisely, by means of the gift of the Holy Spirit, which strengthens the will and performs acts of love fulfilling the law.<sup>135</sup> Augustine calls this help "grace" (*gratia*), rendering by the word deliverance from the fear of punishment, forgiveness of sins on account of penitence, and righteousness bestowed on the grounds of the faith in mercy, not one's acts. The only act required by grace is the very faith in it, or penitence as the other side of faith. It is solely this attitude of humility that enables men to fulfil out of love what fear was not able to fulfil. Bestowed by God *gratis*, grace expects the love which will love him *gratis*—in other words, for his own sake, not in pursuit of another reward—and which will also love one's neighbour for the sake of righteousness. This love, or faith, is the only relevant human "merit", because only it can motivate the acts which will fulfil the law. Paradoxically, love not pursuing merits and rewards becomes the origin of the actual human "merits".<sup>136</sup>

The new attitude of free sons, not slaves in the house of God, can be adopted by men by their participation in Christ's sonship, which in turn is enabled by Christ's participation in humanity in his incarnation. The "forming" to sonship occurs by means of faith; i.e., the attitude of humility imitating the humility of Christ himself. At the same time, the filial adoption as sons of God establishes brotherhood among people, which is sacred for Augustine. The participation in Christ's sonship, Christ's life in the believer, thus creates a new link among people, the organism of the body closely

---

of Paul (V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 198f.). It seems nevertheless that there is a common denominator in both "models", namely the exposition of Rom. 7, which Augustine seems to have undertaken in the attempt to refute the Manichaean interpretation of the passage.

<sup>134</sup> It is the dependence of good human acts on grace that is, in P.-M. Hombert's opinion, the "leitmotiv" of Augustine's expositions of the letters of Paul (see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 87).

<sup>135</sup> The importance of the Holy Spirit, strengthening the will in what it wills (not just giving knowledge), is, according to J.P. Burns, the pneumatological consequence of Augustine's concern with the letters of Paul (see J.P. Burns, *Development*, 36).

<sup>136</sup> Faith thus remains "merit", albeit in a very specific sense. This aspect of Augustine's doctrine of faith in the period of his presbyterate has been emphasized mainly by Lutheran scholars, who perceive it as "sublime synergism" (A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 101 ff., 82 and 94 f.) or the "competition of human and divine wills" (K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 129). J. Lössl rightly argues that the "merit of faith" is not regarded here as an autonomous act of a free will independent of grace. For all that, he also defines Augustine's doctrine on grace from this period as the "hypothesis of division of labour" and regards it as "capable of further development": grace and free will cooperate to the effect that grace compensates the limited ability to act, though not yet the limited free choice of the will (srv. J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 55 f.).

connected with Christ. As the “head” of the body, Christ acts in his limbs: their good deeds performed by the sons of God out of free love are actually his deeds; in other words, it is God who performs them on account of human faith through the gift of the Holy Spirit that mediates Christ’s life in the believers. Faith, or the will to act rightly, is the indispensable prerequisite of this gift, the addressees of which God foreknows without determining their will.

Augustine’s theology from the period of his presbyterate can be regarded as the first, accomplished, and, in my opinion, very fortunate form of his doctrine of grace, not as a mere stage leading to his later teaching.





PART TWO

“THE GRACE OF GOD CONQUERED”  
(395–411)



It was probably in 395 that Augustine was consecrated as the successor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo, who died the following year.<sup>1</sup> By Augustine's own testimony, his first writing after the consecration was an answer to several biblical questions addressed to Simplicianus, his older Italian friend, who (probably later) became the bishop of Milan.<sup>2</sup> One of these answers is concerned with the disputable passage in Romans 9 on the uneven destinies of the twin brothers Esau and Jacob. Augustine's explication follows up on his previous works on the theology of the apostle Paul, but the solution he presents also manifests a remarkable change in his conception of God's grace and human freedom. The conception at which Augustine arrived surprised even himself at first, and it found hardly any echo in his following works from the early years of his episcopate. An exception, though far from insignificant, is what is probably Augustine's most famous work, the thirteen books of his *Confessions*, in which his concern seems to be with enunciating how he currently perceives his conception of grace. It was Augustine's *Confessions* which—by its depiction of human weakness and the indispensable intervention of grace in Christian life—aroused the fears of the ascetic spiritual leader of the Italian aristocracy, Pelagius, and his disciples. Augustine addressed their objections as late as 411, having been fully absorbed until then by another dispute, which posed a much more serious problem for the African church, namely the Donatist schism. Although this predominantly ecclesiological dispute was not directly concerned with the doctrine of grace, Augustine's anti-Donatist emphasis on God's action through the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to P. Brown, Augustine was consecrated as bishop as early as 395, and his predecessor Valerius died the next year (see P. Brown, *Augustine*, 66, 178). On the date of Augustine's consecration as bishop (probably in 395, possibly also between 395 and 397), see O. Perler, "Das Datum der Bischofsweihe des heiligen Augustinus", in: *REAug* 11, 1965, 25–37; for further literature, see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 91 n. 231; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 199 n. 139.

<sup>2</sup> Simplicianus' predecessor Ambrose died in April 397. Augustine addresses Simplicianus as his "father" both in his answer and in the covering letter, but not explicitly as bishop (*Simpl.* proem.: *CCL* 44, 7; *Ep.* 37: *CCL* 44, 3). However, later he says that the answer to his questions was the first to be written after his consecration as bishop and was addressed to Simplicianus as the bishop of Milan (*Retract.* II,1: *CCL* 57, 89; *De praed. sanct.* 4,8: *BA* 24, 484–486; *De dono pers.* 20,52: *BA* 24, 728; *De dono pers.* 21,55: *BA* 24, 734).

church, which cannot be undone by the human weakness of its representatives, could nevertheless have played a role in his view on the relationship between God's grace and human action.

In this chapter we will introduce: (1) Augustine's answer to the questions posed by Simplicianus concerning the Epistle to the Romans; (2) the role of grace in Augustine's *Confessions*; (3) themes related to the doctrine of grace from other works of this period; and (4) topics relevant to the doctrine of grace from the anti-Donatist works.

## CHAPTER ONE

### ANSWER TO SIMPLICIANUS

Simplicianus, Augustine's friend from Milan, and the spiritual father of Bishop Ambrose (who, paradoxically, became his future successor on the bishop's throne in Milan), played an important role in Augustine's conversion: as Augustine discovered the "books of the Platonists", he was told by Simplicianus about the conversion to Christianity of their translator, Marius Victorinus, the famous Roman rhetorician.<sup>1</sup> Simplicianus seems to have frequented the Milanese circle of Christian intellectuals influenced by Platonism, among whom he, as a priest,<sup>2</sup> probably accentuated the importance of the Christian community and its sacraments. It was from his hands that Ambrose received baptism (*pater in accipienda gratia tunc episcopi Ambrosii*),<sup>3</sup> while Marius Victorinus had to face his rebuke that he who does not take part in the church congregation is no Christian (Victorinus first drew a derisive conclusion to the effect that it is, then, "the walls that make Christians", but he received a public baptism in the end).<sup>4</sup> Augustine recalls Simplicianus in his *Confessions* as a respectable, experienced, and educated old man, in whom the grace of God "shone" (*lucebat in eo gratia tua*).<sup>5</sup>

It seems almost symbolic that it is to this man that Augustine—ten years later, fresh from his consecration as bishop in an African province—addresses a work which, to the surprise of the author himself, was to become a kind of manifesto of his new conception of God's grace and the free will of man, and thus open a period in which Augustine, as the bishop of Hippo, went on to retreat substantially from his philosophical interpretation of Christianity from his youth in Milan. As he says in his *Retractationes* about this work: "In the solution of this question, I, indeed, laboured in defence of the free choice of the human will; but the grace of God conquered."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,2,3–5,10: CCL 27,114–119.

<sup>2</sup> For the issue of Simplicianus' priesthood, see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 79 n. 191.

<sup>3</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,2,3: CCL 27,114.

<sup>4</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,2,4: CCL 27,115.

<sup>5</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,1,1: CCL 27,113.

<sup>6</sup> *In cuius quaestionis solutione laboratum est quidem pro libero arbitrio voluntatis humanae, sed vicit Dei gratia* (*Retract.* II,1,1: CCL 57, 89 f.). English translation after M. Inez Bogan, 120.

The answer to Simplicianus includes Augustine's exposition of eight biblical passages in total (Rom. 7:7–25a; Rom. 9:10–29; 1 Sam. 10:10 and 16:14; 1 Sam. 15:11; 1 Sam. 28:12–19; 2 Sam. 7:18; 1 Kings 17:20; 1 Kings 22:19–23); we will introduce the first two in greater detail with respect to our topic (I.1–2). What is of especial interest to us in the following Old Testament questions is Augustine's remark on the two forms of the presence of the Holy Spirit in creation, namely his ordering presence in creation and "sanctifying grace" (*sanctificans gratia*), with which the Spirit fills holy people (e.g. Stephen in the hour of his martyrdom; Acts 7:55).<sup>7</sup> Although the grace in the answer to Simplicianus refers predominantly to the grace of God's calling and the grace supporting the human will (as we will see), Augustine also recognises grace as a sanctifying force which gives men the capacity to perform great deeds.<sup>8</sup>

### 1.1. *Romans 7* (Ad Simplicianum I,1)

Augustine's exposition of Romans 7 presents his doctrine of grace as we already know it from the period of his presbyterate; therefore, only the differences and changes in the emphasis with respect to this conception will be pointed out here. The lines in Rom. 7:7–25a, in which the apostle Paul speaks of the discrepancy between his will and his actions ("For the good that I will to do, I do not do"), are still explicated here as a depiction of the situation of a man "under the law" who knows what the law requires, and yet is not empowered by grace to exercise his good will.<sup>9</sup>

Such an enslavement of man, who is only able to want, but not to put his good intention into practice, stems from "original sin" (*peccatum originale*), as a result of which human beings lost their first nature (*prima natura*) and for which they were punished by mortality as a "kind of a second nature" (*quasi secunda natura*):

<sup>7</sup> See *Simpl.* II,1,5; *CCL* 44, 66.

<sup>8</sup> The second book in the answer to Simplicianus (*Simpl.* II,1) with respect to Augustine's doctrine of grace is dealt with by J. Lössl, who especially points out the sacramental and ecclesiological themes present there: the distinction between the authorities of the king and the prophet on one hand, and personal holiness on the other (with King Saul), these authorities and their significance for the mediation of God's action; see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 98–105.

<sup>9</sup> See *Simpl.* I,1,1: *CCL* 44, 7 f.; *Simpl.* I,1,9: *CCL* 44, 14. On Augustine's two readings of these lines see above, chap. I.3.3b incl. n. 95; below, chap. III.2.4; III.2.8 n. 347; III.3.1.

For willing itself is in our power since it is close at hand, but the fact that doing the good is not in our power is part of the deserts of the original sin. For nothing remains of this first nature of humankind but the punishment of sin, through which mortality itself has become a kind of second nature.<sup>10</sup>

This idea, too, comes from the period of Augustine's presbyterate, with the exception of the term "original sin", which will go on to become (in a somewhat shifted meaning) a technical term.<sup>11</sup> However, a new and more precise classification of sin and its punishment (*poena*) is presented here (although it is built on familiar foundations): while the original sin of the forefather of the human race (*peccatum originale*) was punished by hereditary mortality (*tradux mortalitatis*), the actual sin committed by men (*peccatum frequentatum*) is revenged by adherence to pleasures (*adsiduitas voluptatis*). As a "nature" and "habit", these two sinister components conjoin in the situation of "concupiscence" (*cupiditas*), which cannot be conquered by human beings alone:

Whence comes it that the apostle says that good does not dwell in him (Rom. 7:18), meaning that sin does? What would the answer be except that it comes from the passing on of mortality and the constant repetition of sensual pleasure? The former derives from the punishment for the original sin, the latter from the punishment for repeated sin; with the former we are born into this life, while the latter we augment over the course of our lives. These two things, which we may call nature and habit, create a very strong and unconquerable covetousness (*cupiditatem*) once they have been joined together, which [Paul] refers to as sin and says dwells in his flesh—that is, possesses a certain sovereignty and rule, as it were.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> *Certe enim ipsum velle in potestate est, quoniam adiacet nobis; sed quod perficere bonum non est in potestate, ad meritum pertinet originalis peccati. Non enim est haec prima natura hominis sed delicti poena, per quam facta est ipsa mortalitas quasi secunda natura* (Simpl. I,1,11: CCL 44, 15 f.). English translation by B. Ramsey, 180.

<sup>11</sup> In *Simpl.* I,1, however, this term still refers to the fall of the forefather of the human race, not the inherited sinful condition of his descendants (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 205).

<sup>12</sup> *Unde hoc est, quod dicit habitare in carne sua non utique bonum, id est peccatum?—Unde nisi ex traduce mortalitatis et adsiduitate voluptatis? Illud est ex poena originalis peccati, hoc ex poena frequentati peccati; cum illo in hanc vitam nascimur, hoc vivendo addimus. Quae duo scilicet tamquam natura et consuetudo coniuncta robustissimam faciunt et invictissimam cupiditatem, quod vocat peccatum et dicit habitare in carne sua, id est dominatum quandam et quasi regnum obtinere* (Simpl. I,1,10: CCL 44, 15). English translation after B. Ramsey, 179.



Men thus should not have any illusions about their own powers (*non esse praesumendum de viribus suis*) and should not pride themselves on their deeds. In this life inflicted by mortality, the free decision of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) cannot help men achieve righteousness any more, but can only serve to turn men towards God. Only then, with his help, can they fulfil the law.<sup>13</sup>

It is still the aim of grace to fulfil the law—not a new law introduced by Christ (as the Manichaeans might presume), but the original law given to the Jewish people.<sup>14</sup> What is changed by the coming of grace is not the validity or the content of the law, but the attitude to it. The very commandment which represents an unachievable law for a human being determined by fear becomes grace for a loving one (*idem praeceptum timentibus lex est, amantibus gratia*). Thus through Christ the law becomes grace.<sup>15</sup> The letter of the law is in fact deadly for those who merely read it, but cannot fulfil it, and only to those who fill it with their love does the law reveal its real meaning (*intellectus*).<sup>16</sup> The more delight human beings find in the law (*delectare*), the more they raise themselves to the “spiritual feeling” (*spiritualis adfectus*), and the better they fulfil the law:

In saying this (Rom. 7:14) the apostle clearly indicates that the law cannot be fulfilled except by spiritual persons, who do not become such apart from grace. For a person becomes that much more conformed to the spiritual law—that is, he rises all the more to a spiritual affection—the more he fulfils it, because he takes that much more delight in it when he is no longer worn down by its burdensomeness but energised by its light.<sup>17</sup>

Grace is then the power which gives human beings the affective urge to fulfil the law, and thus becomes the gift of a new and comprehending reading of the law.

---

<sup>13</sup> See *Simpl.* I,1,14: CCL 44, 17f. As V.H. Drecoll points out, the role of faith, which was present in Augustine’s works from the period of his presbyterate, recedes in *Simpl.* I,1; see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 207f.

<sup>14</sup> See *Simpl.* I,1,16: CCL 44, 20.

<sup>15</sup> See *Simpl.* I,1,17: CCL 44, 22.

<sup>16</sup> See *Simpl.* I,1,17: CCL 44, 23. C.P. Bammel emphasises the new conception of the “law” and the “letter” that “killeth” which appears here; see C.P. Bammel, “Augustine”, 354.

<sup>17</sup> *In quo satis ostendit non posse impleri legem nisi ab spiritualibus, qui non fiunt nisi per gratiam. Spirituali enim legi quanto fit quisque similior, id est quanto magis et ipse in spiritalem surgit adfectum, tanto magis eam implet, quia tanto magis ea delectatur iam non sub eius onere adflictus sed in eius lumine vegetatus* (*Simpl.* I,1,7: CCL 44, 12). English translation after B. Ramsey, 177f. The role of *delectatio* in this exposition is accentuated by I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 221f.

1.2. *Romans 9*  
(Ad Simplicianum I,2)

A real change in Augustine's outlook on grace can be found in his answer to the second question posed by Simplicianus, concerned with the destinies of the two brothers, Esau and Jacob (Rom. 9). This theme, too, had already drawn Augustine's attention in the works from the period of the presbyterate, and although the outline of his exposition remains the same, it undergoes substantial radicalisation.<sup>18</sup>

As in the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, in our passage, according to Augustine, the apostle sets out to defy Jewish pride should it maintain that God's grace is given to men according to their merits. No human merits precede grace; on the contrary, they become its fruit when men accept grace by their faith:

And in many places [the apostle] frequently testifies that grace comes before works not in order to do away with works but in order to show that works do not precede but follow upon faith—in other words, so that a person may not think that he has obtained grace because he has done good works but that he cannot do good works unless he has obtained grace through faith.<sup>19</sup>

Just as the fire provides warmth because it radiates, not the other way round, and the wheel spins because it is round, and not vice versa, so does the grace of calling (*gratia vocantis*) justify men and cause their good deeds, and not the other way round:

Grace, then, comes from him who calls, but good works come as a consequence from him who receives grace; they do not beget grace but are begotten by grace. ... It is grace that makes righteous, so that one who has been made righteous can live righteously. Grace, therefore, comes first, and good works are second.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> For the comparison of Augustine's expositions of the whole passage of Rom. 9:6–29 from the period of the presbyterate and from the answer to Simplicianus, see Ph. Platz, *Der Römerbrief*, 248f.

<sup>19</sup> *Et multis locis hoc saepe testatur fidei gratiam praeponens operibus, non ut opera extinguat, sed ut ostendat non esse opera praecedentia gratiam sed consequentia, ut scilicet non se quisque arbitretur ideo percepisse gratiam, quia bene operatus est, sed bene operari non posse, nisi per fidem perceperit gratiam* (Simpl. I,2,2: CCL 44, 24f.). English translation by B. Ramsey, 185.

<sup>20</sup> *Vocantis est ergo gratia, percipientis vero gratiam consequenter sunt opera bona, non quae gratiam pariant, sed quae gratia pariantur. ... Iustificat autem gratia, ut iustificatus possit iuste vivere. Prima est igitur gratia, secunda opera bona* (Simpl. I,2,3: CCL 44, 27). English translation by B. Ramsey, 187.

Good deeds, then, do not bring about grace, as we already know from Augustine's previous accounts, not even in the sense of God's foreknowing them and bestowing grace on the ground of his foreknowledge. However, can Augustine's present solution, according to which God foreknows not the deeds, but the faith of a human being, and bestows the grace of justification and election, hold up? Could it not be argued that the faith of men based on their will is only a special case of a human act which brings forth grace? Does grace not become a reward for one's acts after all? As if anticipating this "Lutheran" objection, Augustine comes to realise that God's election, based on God's knowledge of the future human faith, is actually equal to God's election on account of the future knowledge of human acts. Just as God foreknows faith, so he foreknows human acts, and it might be argued that he justifies men on account of their future acts; in other words, one would be indistinguishable from the other: "If election is made through foreknowledge, then, and God foreknew Jacob's faith, how do you prove that he did not also choose him because of his works?"<sup>21</sup>

If, in accordance with the apostle's teaching, men are to be justified by grace, not on account of their acts, then not even the merit of human faith can precede grace, but it must be given by it. Grace thus precedes all human merits (*ante omne meritum est gratia*), including the merit of faith.<sup>22</sup> God justifies a sinner by calling him to faith by means of grace (*vocando ad fidem gratia iustificat impium*), which brings justification (*iustificatio*) and, together with it, election (*electio*). "The calling which will fulfil God's intention (*propositum dei*)", which Augustine used to regard as dependent on the freely chosen faith of man, now stands at the beginning of the whole process, not at its end: God's calling comes out of God's intention and means election. The one who was called by God is endowed with justifying faith and is therefore the chosen one:

---

<sup>21</sup> *Si igitur electio per praescientiam, praescivit autem Deus fidem Iacob, unde probas quia non etiam ex operibus elegit eum?* (*Simpl.* 1,2,5: CCL 44, 29,145–147). English translation by B. Ramsey, 189. For the whole passage, see *Simpl.* 1,2,5: CCL 44, 29 f. As A. Zeoli rightly remarks, this motive for abandoning the conception of God's predestination as the foreknowledge of future faith cannot be regarded as a convincing reason (see A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 77–79).

<sup>22</sup> See *Simpl.* 1,2,7: CCL 44, 31 f. As V.H. Drecoll points out, faith is not perceived here as human dependence on God which is pneumatologically mediated, but, by analogy to "acts", as an independent act of man and a counterpart of grace; this conception will be abandoned in the course of *Simpl.* 1,2 (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 224 f.).

God's purpose, therefore, does not abide on account of election, but the election results from the purpose—that is, it is not because God discovers in human beings good works that he chooses, and that therefore his plan of making righteous abides, but because it abides in order to make righteous those who believe, and that therefore he discovers works that he may now choose for the kingdom of heaven. ... Yet it is not election that precedes making righteous but making righteous that precedes election. For no one is chosen unless he is already entirely different (*nisi iam distans*) than a person who is rejected.<sup>23</sup>

Is there any point, then, in distinguishing the initial general calling and the narrower election based on faith, i.e., “the calling which will fulfil God's purpose”? In order to do justice to the biblical statement that “many are called, but few are chosen” (Matt. 22:14), Augustine still makes a distinction between the wider “calling” and the narrower “proper calling” (*vocatio congrua* or *apta*), but it is God who determines the “appropriateness” by bestowing faith:

*It is not a matter of willing or of running, therefore, but of a merciful God* (Rom. 9:16), who called in a way that was appropriate (*quomodo aptum erat*) for those who followed the call. The call has indeed reached others, but because it was such that they could not be moved by it and were not suited to grasp it, they could indeed be said to have been called but not chosen. ... [I]f God should will to have mercy even on those persons, he could call them in such a way as would be appropriate for them (*quomodo illis aptum esset*), so that they would be moved and would understand and would follow. This, then, is correct: *Many are called, but few are chosen* (Matt. 20:16). For the chosen are those who have been called in an appropriate way (*congruenter vocati*), whereas those who did not consent and were not obedient to the call are not chosen, because they did not follow even though they were called. ... But the person on whom he has mercy he calls in such a way as he knows is appropriate for him (*quomodo scit ei congruere*), so that he may not reject him who calls.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> *Non ergo secundum electionem propositum Dei manet, sed ex proposito electio, id est non quia invenit Deus opera bona in hominibus quae eligat, ideo manet propositum iustificationis ipsius, sed quia illud manet ut iustificet credentes, ideo invenit opera quae iam eligat ad regnum caelorum. ... Non tamen electio praecedat iustificationem sed electionem iustificatio. Nemo enim eligitur nisi iam distans ab illo qui reicitur* (Simpl. I,2,6: CCL 44, 31). English translation after B. Ramsey, 190.

<sup>24</sup> *Igitur non volentis neque currentis sed miserentis est Dei, qui hoc modo vocavit, quomodo aptum erat eis qui secuti sunt vocationem? Ad alios autem vocatio quidem pervenit, sed quia talis fuit, qua moveri non possent nec eam capere apti essent, vocati quidem dici potuerunt sed non electi; quia si vellet etiam ipsorum misereri, posset ita vocare, quomodo illis aptum esset, ut et moverentur et intellegerent et sequerentur. Verum est ergo: Multi vocati, pauci electi. Illi enim electi qui congruenter vocati, illi autem qui non congruebant neque contemperabantur vocationi non electi, quia non secuti quamvis vocati. ... Cuius autem miseretur, sic eum vocat,*

In this account, the justification of men is still dependent on their faith, but the faith itself is God's gift. Why is one endowed with it and another not? Why did God choose the younger twin, Jacob, and hate the older, Esau, when they were still in their mother's womb? This choice cannot be determined by the future acts or the future faith of either brother, says Augustine. Is it, then, determined by their future adoption of faith, their will to believe? But even this faith, the very fact *that* someone wants to believe (*ut velimus*), is, in Augustine's opinion, God's gift (cf. Phil. 2:13<sup>25</sup>), for it is dependent on God's calling (*nec velle possumus nisi vocati*). Nevertheless, the given wanting is still determined by human consent, i.e., human obedience to God's calling: *Ut velimus suum et nostrum, suum vocando nostrum sequendo*.<sup>26</sup>

Although all the primary initiative in faith pertains to God's calling, there still seems to remain space for the free choice of the will, consisting in its consent. This raises the question of whether human will must answer to God's calling. Augustine's answer is positive, but even the consent with this gift is God's gift:

For if God is merciful, we also will. It pertains to the same mercy, in fact, that we will, *for it is God who, for the sake of a good will, works in us both the willing and working* (Phil. 2:13). For if we asked whether a good will (*voluntas bona*) was God's gift, it would be strange if someone dared to deny it. For, since it is not a good will that precedes a call (*vocatio*) but a call that precedes a good will, it is rightly ascribed to God who calls that we will what is good, but it cannot be ascribed to us that we are called. It must not be thought, then, that these words, *It is not a matter of willing or of running but of a merciful God* (Rom. 9:16), were said because without his aid we cannot attain to what we will but rather because without his call we do not will.<sup>27</sup>

---

*quomodo scit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuat* (Simpl. I,2,13: CCL 44, 37 f.). English translation after B. Ramsey, 195. According to V.H. Drecoll, here Augustine abandons the notion that the relationship between grace and the human will is merely one of temporal anteriority and takes the view that grace precedes the will as its cause as well (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 231).

<sup>25</sup> Phil. 2:13, frequently employed in the subsequent polemic against the Pelagians, is quoted by Augustine in the answer to Simplicianus for the first time (see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 93).

<sup>26</sup> Simpl. I,2,10: CCL 44, 34 f.

<sup>27</sup> *Si enim Deus miseretur, etiam volumus. Ad eandem quippe misericordiam pertinet ut velimus; Deus enim est qui operatur in nobis et velle et operari pro bona voluntate. Nam si quaeramus, utrum Dei donum sit voluntas bona, mirum si negare quisquam audeat. At enim quia non praecedit voluntas bona vocationem sed vocatio bonam voluntatem, propterea vocanti Deo recte tribuitur quod bene volumus, nobis vero tribui non potest quod vocamur. Non igitur ideo dictum putandum est: Non volentis neque currentis sed miserentis est Dei, quia nisi eius adiutorio non possumus adipisci quod volumus, sed ideo potius quia nisi eius vocatione non volumus* (Simpl. I,2,12: CCL 44, 37). English translation by B. Ramsey, 194.

Only grace can make a man enslaved by sin find delight (*delectare*) in turning towards God. Men are not able to make their will find such delight on their own, and nobody will do it without the delight:

Who has it in his power for his mind to be touched by such a manifestation (*tali viso attingi*) as would move his will to faith? Who embraced in his heart something that he does not take delight (*delectat*) in? Who has it in his power either to come into contact with what he takes delight in or to be delighted once he has come into contact with it? When, therefore, things delight us whereby we may advance towards God, this is inspired and furnished by the grace of God; it is not obtained by our own assent (*nutu nostro*) and effort or by merits of our works because, whether it be the assent of our will (*nutus voluntatis*) or our intense effort or our works aglow with charity, it is he who gives, he who bestows it.<sup>28</sup>

Augustine reaches the inevitable conclusion: "The free choice of the will counts for a great deal (*plurimum valet*), to be sure. But what does it count for in those who have been sold under sin?"<sup>29</sup>

The choice of the will thus loses its constitutive role in faith. "In the solution of this question, I, indeed, laboured in defence of the free choice of the human will; but the grace of God conquered."<sup>30</sup> What remains to be done is to think over the points of departure and the consequences of this result.

There are two points of departure that Augustine reveals. First, he aims to do justice to the apostle's statement that men do not have anything good that they did not receive and could thus "boast" (1 Cor. 4:7), i.e., there is nothing they could regard as their own act and independent of God.<sup>31</sup> Everything, including the human consent to the will to believe, must therefore be God's gift. Second, Augustine refuses to subscribe to the view that God's mercy might be dependent on human consent: "the effectiveness of God's mercy cannot be in man's power, so that he would be merciful to no avail if man

---

<sup>28</sup> *Quis habet in potestate tali viso attingi mentem suam, quo eius voluntas moveatur ad fidem? Quis autem animo amplectitur aliquid quod eum non delectat? Aut quis habet in potestate, ut vel occurrat quod eum delectare possit, vel delectet cum occurrerit? Cum ergo nos ea delectant quibus proficiamus ad Deum, inspiratur hoc et praebetur gratia Dei, non nutu nostro et industria aut operum meritis comparatur, quia ut sit nutus voluntatis, ut sit industria studii, ut sint opera caritate ferventia, ille tribuit, ille largitur* (Simpl. I,2,21: CCL 44, 53 f.). English translation after B. Ramsey, 205.

<sup>29</sup> *Liberum voluntatis arbitrium plurimum valet, immo vero est quidem, sed in venundatis sub peccato quid valet?* (Simpl. I,2,21: CCL 44, 53). English translation by B. Ramsey, 205.

<sup>30</sup> See *Retract.* II,1,1: CCL 57, 89 f.

<sup>31</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,9: CCL 44, 34; *Simpl.* I,2,21: CCL 44, 53.

were unwilling ...”<sup>32</sup> In that case, it would not hold that it is “not of him who wills, nor of him who runs, but of God, who shows mercy” (Rom. 9:16), for “the mercy of him who calls is insufficient unless there follows the obedience of the one who has been called”.<sup>33</sup> In Augustine’s current doctrine of grace, nothing must be dependent on man, and God’s will must be efficacious on its own account, without any constraints.

However, can this sovereign divine will still be regarded as just? Does it still hold that God gives all men their due on account of their acts, or at least their will? Was it fair that God chose Jacob and repudiated Esau when they were still in their mother’s womb? Why was Esau not called in the same “proper” way so that he could obey?<sup>34</sup>

In order to vindicate God’s justice, Augustine must show that Esau deserved his repudiation as a punishment (*supplicium*), though not by his acts, for while in his mother’s womb he performed none in the strict sense, but as a member of the Adamite “mass of sin” (*massa peccati*) or “mass of sinners” (*massa peccatorum*), worthy of reprobation as a whole:

Therefore, all human beings—since, as the Apostle says, *all die in Adam* (1 Cor. 15:22), from whom the origin of the offense against God spread throughout the whole human race—are a kind of single mass of sin (*una quaedam massa peccati*) owing a debt of punishment to the divine and supreme justice, and whether [the punishment that is owed] be exacted or forgiven, there is no injustice. ... [N]o one resists his will, because whom he wills he sustains and whom he wills he abandons (cf. Rom. 9:18), since both the one whom he sustains and the one whom he abandons come from the same mass of sinners (*ex eadem massa sint peccatorum*) and, although both owe a debt of punishment, yet it is exacted from one and forgiven another ...<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> ... *non potest effectus misericordiae Dei esse in hominis potestate, ut frustra ille misereatur, si homo nolit* (*Simpl.* I,2,13: CCL 44, 38). English translation by B. Ramsey, 195. According to V.H. Drecoll, the term “mercy” (*miser cordia*) is parallel here with “grace” (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 238).

<sup>33</sup> ... *quia misericordia vocantis non sufficit, nisi vocati oboedientia consequatur* (*Simpl.* I,2,13: CCL 44, 37). English translation by B. Ramsey, 194.

<sup>34</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,14: CCL 44, 38 f.

<sup>35</sup> *Sunt igitur omnes homines—quando quidem, ut apostolus ait, in Adam omnes moriuntur, a quo in univ ersum genus humanum origo ducitur offensionis Dei—una quaedam massa peccati supplicium debens divinae summaeque iustitiae, quod sive exigatur sive donetur, nulla est iniquitas. ... voluntati eius nullus resistit quia cui vult subvenit et quem vult deserit, cum et ille cui subvenit et ille quem deserit ex eadem massa sint peccatorum et, quamvis debeat uterque supplicium, ab uno tamen exigatur alteri donetur ...* (*Simpl.* I,2,16–17: CCL 44, 41–43). English translation by B. Ramsey, 198. As K. Flasch points out, here Augustine modifies his notion of the inherited burden of mortality and constraints which predispose men to sin, and subscribes to the idea of inherited *guilt*, which deserves to be punished in itself, regardless

God took mercy upon some of this “mass”, leaving the others to the condign perdition (in this sense it is said that God “hardened” someone’s heart). For as the apostle has it, it is from the same mass that the divine potter makes “vessels of honour” and “vessels of dishonour”: the former are made such gratuitously, the latter rightly so, and nobody can therefore boast or moan. God’s gratuitous mercy upon Jacob does not diminish the deservedness of Esau’s punishment. “O man, who are you” to ask why God chose one over the other? (Rom. 9:20).<sup>36</sup>

God does not favour people as such: in Jacob he loves his own mercy, in Esau he hates his sin.<sup>37</sup> This sin, however, cannot thwart God’s intention itself; on the contrary, the destiny of poor Esau serves as a reminder for the benefit of the chosen ones: “The righteous shall wash his hands in the blood of the wicked” (cf. Ps. 57:11[58:10]).<sup>38</sup>

In the universe of God’s will as the only sovereign cause, all human destinies thus fulfil the perfect divine order, irrespective of who was chosen for salvation or left to perdition.<sup>39</sup> If men are to have no merits of their own and God’s mercy is not to be thwarted in any way, but, at the same time, if God is to be just, then all people coming from Adam must deserve perdition

---

of human acts. Although this notion is not elaborated in greater detail here, it is logically implied (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 72 ff.; 84 and 312 f.). The attempts at expounding the inherited guilt as “solidarity” of the human race (see M.E. Alflatt, “The Responsibility for Involuntary Sin in Saint Augustine”, in: *RechAug* 10, 1975, 171–186), are, in my opinion, not wholly convincing.

<sup>36</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,16–17: CCL 44, 41–43. A. Niebergall rightly says that Augustine has actually reached the notion of “double predestination” (*gemina praedestinatio*); see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 135 f. Although Augustine never came to maintain that God might bring anyone to evil on purpose, he holds that God predestined one group of people to salvation, intentionally leaving the other one to sin.

<sup>37</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,18: CCL 44, 45 f. A. Pincherle remarks that God’s delight in his own mercy or God’s dislike of sin as a motive for his choice is actually a return to the notion of justification as retribution (see A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 158 f.). K. Flasch denounces this motive as evidence of God’s perverted love, which loves only itself (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 93 ff.).

<sup>38</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,18: CCL 44, 47. Augustine’s employment of this line especially drew the attention of K. Flasch, who can see streams of blood running from this place in the whole of Christian history following Augustine (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 80 f.; this opinion is rejected as unsubstantiated by T.G. Ring, who also criticises Flasch’s other provocative statements; see T.G. Ring, “Bruch oder Entwicklung im Gnadenbegriff Augustins? Kritische Anmerkungen zu K. Flasch, *Logik des Schreckens. Augustinus von Hippo, Die Gnadenlehre von 397*”, in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 31–113, esp. 70 ff.). The same theme returns in *Enarr. Psalm. 57,21: CSEL* 94/1, 310 f. The “usefulness” of evil in the history of salvation is nonetheless a frequent theme in Augustine’s work. See A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L’ordre*, 436–460.

<sup>39</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,22: CCL 44, 56.



before they are born. Such is the *intellectus gratiae*<sup>40</sup> that Augustine achieved in his answer to Simplicianus.

\*\*\*

In the early period of his episcopate, through the answer to Simplicianus (I,2), Augustine arrives at a new solution to the relationship between God's grace and human freedom: in his opinion, the free choice of the will is paralysed by sin (both the inherited one and one's own) to such an extent that it is not capable of turning to faith or even giving consent to such a turning without God's help. God's help to the human will consists in his arranging of the circumstances in such a way that a human being finds delight in this turning. Why God aids one and refuses his help to another has no reasons comprehensible to men; it is decided by God alone of his own inscrutable will (not according to future human acts or future faith), or rather, it had been decided by him before the world was created. Those who are not among the chosen ones will be justly reprobated for the sin which burdens the whole human race as a result of the pride of the first of men. The inherited sin has not only the character of inherited weakness and propensity to failure, but also guilt, for which all human beings may be justly reprobated even when they are still in their mother's womb.

Various scholars judge this new conclusion of Augustine's in very different ways, according to their theological orientation. Alfred Niebergall observes with satisfaction that Augustine finally abandoned all his synergism even in its most sophisticated form and renounced the "speculation about justice" following human measures in order to come to appreciate God's "graceful omnipotence" ("gnädige Allmacht"). However, he also points out that this conception of grace at which Augustine arrived by means of ontological, not e.g. sacramentological, reasoning, lacks a

---

<sup>40</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,21: CCL 44, 53,737. The theme of *intellectus* as the prerequisite and, at the same time, the content of grace is the point of departure of J. Lössl's interpretation of Augustine's doctrine of grace (see *Intellectus, passim*). The hermeneutic circle presupposed by the author, however, threatens to become *petitio principii* instead: it is the willingness to accept the paradoxicality of Augustine's solution that makes it possible to understand it, yet such a resolution is the outcome of the same understanding. Although not intended to be so, the reader's impression is that Augustine's doctrine of grace is a kind of jump into absurdity which can only be justified with hindsight. A rather different interpretation of the theme of "understanding" or "insight" (*intellectus*) can be found in K. Flasch, who emphasises that Augustine's concern was with a rational grasp of grace, not fiducialism (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 99, 108). Both authors do justice to Augustine in a way: he was certainly concerned with a rationally established doctrine of grace, but the structure also includes paradoxical, if not absurd elements.

connection with Christology and ecclesiology.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, Karl Janssen acknowledges the fact that Augustine “came very close to the *sola fide* principle”, but there is still a residue of the “mutuality of the divine and human will” in the form of delight (*delectatio*), which God must evoke in man in order to persuade his will. On the other hand, Jansen is aware that in this conception, grace threatens to become violence.<sup>42</sup> The problematic nature of Augustine’s new position, which differs in its speculativeness from Paul’s theology, is also acknowledged by Gotthard Nygren, who speaks of its “paradoxicality” (“Paradoxie” or “Paradoxalität”);<sup>43</sup> this, however, he interprets in terms of not an “absolute” but “relative” freedom, which makes it possible for the will to achieve a true merit of faith and good works, even though it is a merit given by grace and one excluding synergism.<sup>44</sup>

Angelo Zeoli sincerely despairs at Augustine’s new approach to grace, regarding it not only as a distortion of the New Testament message about grace, but also of Paul’s theology itself: in his opinion, the title *doctor gratiae* belongs to Augustine as a result of the systematic nature of his thoughts on grace, but not because of their conclusion.<sup>45</sup> A similar position is maintained by Vladimír Boublík in his comparison of predestination according to Augustine and the apostle Paul.<sup>46</sup> Aimé Solignac, too, points out Augustine’s inappropriate interpretation of Paul’s theology, in which the secret of election is not related to Adam’s sin; in his article, he also deals with Augustine’s further “excesses” caused by his exaggerated pursuit of consistency in thinking.<sup>47</sup> A very interesting interpretation is provided by John M. Rist, who, in his analysis of Augustine’s conception of free will, says that the notion of the irresistible divine will degrades the fallen men to “puppets”, “free in the sense only of being arranged to act in a way which is not subject to external pressures”.<sup>48</sup> According to Rist, only the “irresistibility” of God’s will is

<sup>41</sup> See A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 134–152.

<sup>42</sup> See K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*, 131–135.

<sup>43</sup> See G. Nygren, *Das Prädestinationsproblem in der Theologie Augustins. Eine systematisch-theologische Studie*, Lund 1956, 48. On the comparison with Paul, see *ibid.* 103–137.

<sup>44</sup> See G. Nygren, *Das Prädestinationsproblem*, 286–288 and 279.

<sup>45</sup> See A. Zeoli, *La teologia*, 116–156.

<sup>46</sup> See V. Boublík, *La predestinazione. S. Paolo e S. Agostino*, Roma 1961.

<sup>47</sup> See A. Solignac, “Les excès de «intellectus fidei» dans la doctrine d’Augustin sur la grâce”, in: *NRTh* 110, 1988, 828.

<sup>48</sup> See J.M. Rist, “Augustine”, 440. Though grace cannot be resisted, it does not exert pressure; it is “irresistible without being constraining” (*ibid.* 434f.). Rist borrows this last formulation from E. Gilson, *Introduction à l’étude de saint Augustin*, Paris 1929, 195f.

able to overcome the “irresistibility” of the fall which occurs to any being created from nothing.<sup>49</sup> If men became “unable to sin” through their own choice, says Rist, they would probably be equal to God in Augustine’s eyes, which cannot be tolerated.<sup>50</sup>

The theme of violence, inevitably related to the notion of grace that is not dependent on the criteria of retribution, but on the unpredictable whim of a godhead in the oriental vein, is unmasked by Kurt Flasch, who, at the same time, rejects the idea of God’s affecting the will as “Überwältigungspsychologie”.<sup>51</sup>

An entirely different approach to the work is adopted by James P. Burns, who does not find a radical change in the answer to Simplicianus with respect to Augustine’s previous position. The acceptance of grace, in his opinion, still depends on the human will, although, admittedly, it must be supported by grace and although the attraction of the aim is not brought about by the will itself, but God’s scenario. For all that, the argument goes, it would be quite erroneous to regard this solution, still influenced by the anti-Manichaean polemic, as equal to Augustine’s later thoughts elaborated in the Pelagian dispute.<sup>52</sup> Burns’ view is very rare and, in my opinion, does not do justice to the text; nor does the judgment of Josef Lössl, who regards Augustine’s argumentation as “confused and inconsistent”.<sup>53</sup> This author rightly points out several “open questions”,<sup>54</sup> yet these cannot be accounted for by confused argumentation, but by the inconsistency of the solution, which, in my opinion (which is different from Lössl’s), Augustine never overcame.

Volker H. Drecoll makes it clear that here Augustine has overcome the notion of grace that is efficacious only through rational understanding. The author mainly perceives *Simpl.* I,2 as the consequence of Augustine’s notion of God as immutable on one hand and, on the other hand, determining everything else. It is a certain application of Augustine’s Neoplatonising ontology in the doctrine of grace, which, however, lacks a connection with pneumatology and Christology.<sup>55</sup> In his interpretation, Pierre-

---

<sup>49</sup> See J.M. Rist, “Augustine”, 440–442.

<sup>50</sup> See J.M. Rist, “Augustine”, postscript, 447–447a.

<sup>51</sup> See K. Flasch, *Logik*, 114–121 and 317 f.

<sup>52</sup> See J.P. Burns, *Development*, 39–44.

<sup>53</sup> See J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 90.

<sup>54</sup> See J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 89.

<sup>55</sup> See V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 241–246.

Marie Hombert draws attention to the spiritual motivation of Augustine's thoughts: a human being depends entirely on grace, having nothing to "boast".<sup>56</sup>

Not quite usual (and, in my opinion, very one-sided) is the interpretation of Carol Harrison, who regards Augustine's older expositions of the epistles of Paul as a not very successful and inconsistent experiment (with an anti-Manichaean motivation), while in the answer to Simplicianus she finds not only a theology fully adequate to that of Paul, but also a position adopted by Augustine during his conversion in 386.<sup>57</sup> Quite the opposite is maintained by Gaetano Lettieri, who considers the answer to Simplicianus to be a true collapse ("catastrophe") of Augustine's theological strategy so far; this point means "spiritualisation and interiorisation of an irreducible eschatological component present in the biblical tradition".<sup>58</sup>

As far as the possible sources of the new understanding of grace are concerned, Augustine himself refers to his reading of Cyprian, who drew his attention to the meaning of the line in 1 Cor. 4:7.<sup>59</sup> Alberto Pincherle shows, however, that this probably became his support only later; it was welcome in the dispute with the Pelagians and was projected retrospectively into the period when Augustine was giving the answer to Simplicianus. The actual inspiration of this period is said to have been Tyconius, the Donatist exegete<sup>60</sup> (who, in his rule concerning the law and promises, states, among other things, that "without God's grace, fame is impossible" and who also quotes the lines from 1 Cor. 1:31 and 4:7<sup>61</sup>). While the former statement is now generally accepted, the latter seems uncertain: in his grasp of Paul's theology, Augustine presumably owed much to Tyconius, whose conception of grace, however, corresponds more to Augustine's previous conception from the period of the presbyterate.<sup>62</sup> Augustine probably arrived at his new conception of grace through his own reflection on the epistles of Paul,<sup>63</sup>

<sup>56</sup> See P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 104–108.

<sup>57</sup> See C. Harrison, *Rethinking*, 7, 130–142, 151–154, 161–163 *et passim*. In the same vein, P. Cary, *Inner Grace: Augustine in the Traditions of Plato and Paul*, Oxford 2008, 45–62.

<sup>58</sup> See G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino*, 130; concerning the "catastrophe", see e.g. 92, 96, 609; for Lettieri's interpretation of *Simpl.* 1,2, see 86–90.

<sup>59</sup> See *Retract.* II,1,1: *CCL* 57, 90; *De praed. sanct.* 3,7: *BA* 24, 478; *De praed. sanct.* 4,8: *BA* 24, 488. See below, chap. III.2.8 incl. n. 350.

<sup>60</sup> See A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 186–188.

<sup>61</sup> See Tyconius, *Regulae*, 3,13,1: *SC* 488, 186.

<sup>62</sup> See e.g. W.S. Babcock, "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans (A.D. 394–396)", in: *AugSt* 10, 1979, 55–74; idem, "Augustine and Tyconius. A Study in the Latin Appropriation of Paul", in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1982, 1209–1215; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 157.

<sup>63</sup> See P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 99–103, who also summarises the older discussion.

together with his own notion of God, who abides as immutable, but, at the same time, determines everything.<sup>64</sup> Perhaps it was not only Paul's theology that played a role in Augustine's doctrine of grace, but also Paul's sudden "violent" conversion, as depicted in the New Testament (see Acts 9:3–9).<sup>65</sup>

Whatever the sources may be, I do not regard Augustine's *intellectus gratiae* from the answer to Simplicianus as particularly satisfactory. The notion of inherited human guilt as personal and justly punishable guiltiness (not merely a "punishment" in the form of mortality) and the idea that God incomprehensibly elects one and leaves another to a "deserved" punishment, irrespective of human acts, seem to be its necessary but morally and theologically unacceptable consequences. However, if the consequences of Augustine's thinking are unacceptable, then either the proceeding of his thought or its very premises are wrong.

The justifiability of Augustine's premises is by no means obvious. Does it really hold that human beings cannot have any merits of their own so that they could not boast and that the efficacy of God's will cannot be dependent on human consent? Would it not be possible (and perhaps more effective) to face the pride of one's own merits in some other way than by their complete repudiation? Is it not the case that an image of God, who, in the realisation of his plans with men, makes himself dependent on them, would be more appropriate to the biblical message (and the New Testament message in particular) than the notion of an arbitrary sovereign godhead deciding even about human consent?

As for the way in which Augustine proceeds in his thinking, it may rightly be objected that he draws on a model of a kind of "competition" between God's initiatives and human ones.<sup>66</sup> According to Augustine, human will or consent with one's own will is brought on either by God alone, or man alone. Yet does this binary notion do justice to the mysterious presence of God in human hearts and to the mysterious way in which God enters the world of men? Would it not be possible—and more appropriate to the principles of Christian theology—to argue that the doctrine of grace should follow the paradigm of Christology, in other words, that in human good deeds both God and men act wholly, just as God and man were wholly in Christ

---

<sup>64</sup> See V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 244f.

<sup>65</sup> See P. Fredriksen, "Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy. Augustine and Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians", in: *RechAug* 23, 1988, 102–105.

<sup>66</sup> K. Flasch rightly points out this fact (see *Logik*, 48), but he later makes it clear that there can actually be no competition at the point where human freedom is only an "epiphenomenon of grace" (*Logik*, postscript to the second edition, 329).

himself?<sup>67</sup> Though it was as late as twenty years after Augustine's death (in 451) that Christian Christology arrived at this Chalcedonian solution, the complete absence of Christology of any kind (on which the doctrine of grace should draw) in Augustine's thought is striking and may be one of the reasons for its theological inadequacy.<sup>68</sup> If some authors sensed a theological affinity between the Pelagian notion of grace and Nestorius' Christology,<sup>69</sup> it might presumably be possible—with the same degree of accuracy or inaccuracy—to see a certain affinity between Augustine's doctrine of grace and the Christology emphasising the priority of God's share over the human one, as it asserted itself at the Council of Ephesus in 431 as a result of the efforts of Cyril of Alexandria—with whom, by the way, the bishop of Hippo corresponded about the anti-Pelagian campaign.<sup>70</sup>

Moreover, Augustine's solution contains some "technical" problems (for example, the question of how the personal guilt related to the soul is actually inherited), which will come to light in his polemic against the Pelagians. However, fifteen years will still have to pass before the dispute breaks out.

---

<sup>67</sup> It is along these lines that R. Strauss gives a systematic interpretation of Augustine's theology, attempting to grasp Augustine's conception of the relation of grace and freedom as "perichoretic synergism"; see R. Strauss, *Der neue Mensch innerhalb der Theologie Augustins*, Zürich 1967, esp. 82–85 and 106–110. M. Hanby also perceives Augustine's position as "proto-Chalcedonian mechanics" or "doxological ontology"; see M. Hanby, *Augustine and Modernity*, London 2003, 108. I am afraid, however, that these attempts are not a very convincing reading of Augustine's answer to Simplicianus.

<sup>68</sup> Augustine will, somewhat additionally, go on to establish a kind of "Christology of grace" related to his doctrine of grace, i.e., the notion of the man Jesus as a paradigm of predestination and gratuity, who, without any merits of his own, was given communion with the divine Word in a single person and in whom—as he was born from a virgin and thus protected from inherited guilt—the possibility of a will turned unflinchingly towards the good, lost by Adam, was realised (see below, chap. III.2.2; III.2.8; III.2.10b.).

<sup>69</sup> See below, p. 163 f. incl. n. 21.

<sup>70</sup> See below, p. 170 f. incl. n. 21.



## CHAPTER TWO

### CONFESSIONS

The thirteen books of the *Confessions* are undoubtedly among the most renowned works of Christian literature ever. At the same time, they are a work shrouded in much that is unclear. Why, shortly after his consecration as bishop of Hippo,<sup>1</sup> did Augustine decide to make an account of his path to Christianity and, in particular, of the circumstances of his “conversion”, i.e., the resolution to take up an ascetic life which he had adopted more than ten years earlier in Milan? Why did he add to his autobiography the last three books dealing with time and the creation of the world?<sup>2</sup> Is Augustine’s book of *Confessions* a testimony to his “spiritual crisis” brought about by the reading of Pauline works,<sup>3</sup> or simply an inner necessity of this restless mind?<sup>4</sup> Did he perhaps, as a Catholic bishop in Africa, which was split by the Donatist schism, seek to cope publicly with his Manichaean past, both personal and doctrinal?<sup>5</sup> Or did he want to create a model of his newly

---

<sup>1</sup> Augustine’s *Confessions* are usually dated to the period 397–401; however, P.-M. Hombert holds that the work was interrupted early after it was begun in 397, presuming that books I–IX were written in 400 and books X–XIII as late as 403 (see P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 9–23).

<sup>2</sup> I. Bochet seeks to provide a new answer to this question, following up the hermeneutics of P. Ricoeur: Augustine’s new self-understanding, an account of which appears in the *Confessions*, is inseparably connected with his understanding of Scripture (“self-understanding in the light of the text [devant le texte]”); that is why the author reads the *Confessions* in the light of Augustine’s biblical expositions (I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 92 ff.). Augustine’s hermeneutics as the hermeneutics of the biblical text and, at the same time, the hermeneutics of oneself is, in her opinion, “hermeneutics of grace”, for grace is the content of Scripture which must become reality in the heart of man (ibid. 503).

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. A. Pincherle, *La formazione*, 195.

<sup>4</sup> Such is the opinion of A. Solignac, “Introduction”, in: *BA* 13, 26–36.

<sup>5</sup> See the allusions in *Confess.* X (P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 15 f.). The echoes of the Donatist criticism of Augustine’s Manichaean past (drawing, however, partially from the *Confessions*) can be seen e.g. in *Contra litt. Petil.* I,26,28: *BA* 30, 182; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,18,40: *BA* 30, 268; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,10,11: *BA* 30, 610; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,17,20: *BA* 30, 624; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,25,30: *BA* 30, 644; *Contra Cresc.* III,78,90–79,91: *BA* 31, 454–456; perhaps also in the Donatist question concerning the person who ordained Augustine to the office of bishop in *Brev. coll. Don.* III,7,9: *BA* 32, 150; see P. Courcelle, *Recherches*, 238–245; E. Lamirande, “Accusations lancées contre Augustin” (note complémentaire 17), in: *BA* 32, Paris 1965, 711 f.; B. Quinot, “Les accusations de manichéisme portées par Petilianus” (note complémentaire 10), in: *BA* 30, Paris 1967, 769 ff.; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 260–263. The ubiquity of



found doctrine of grace from the shapeable matter of his own memories and set it in a cosmological frame?<sup>6</sup> I do not intend to claim that Augustine followed only the last aim in his *Confessions*, on which he probably worked for four years after his answer to Simplicianus. With respect to our theme, nevertheless, the *Confessions* will be read from this perspective and only such passages as point to this aim will be chosen.<sup>7</sup>

### 2.1. *God's Presence in Man* (*Confessiones I*)

The introductory prayer in the first book of the *Confessions* resembles the opening prayer in Augustine's *Soliloquies*. Yet he does not pray for the knowledge of God-Truth, but what he mainly asks is for God, the creator of heaven and earth, who "resists the proud, and gives grace to the humble" (cf. Prov. 3:34 LXX; James 4:6; 1 Pet. 5:5),<sup>8</sup> to enter Augustine's heart (*in me*

---

Manichaeism in the *Confessions* is also demonstrated by J. van Oort, "Manichaeism and Antimanichaeism in Augustine's Confessions", in: L. Cirilo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso*, 235–247; the anti-Manichaean purport of book XIII is discussed by I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 237–248.

<sup>6</sup> For the *Confessions* as a "paradigm of the doctrine of grace", see below, chap. II.2.3, n. 36. The cosmological setting of this doctrine in *Confess.* XI–XIII is pointed out by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 125 f. The author also summarises the discussion according to which Augustine might have wanted to introduce to his friends (Simplicianus, who probably never replied to his book [*Simpl.*], and Paulinus of Nola, to whom he had addressed his thoughts in *De libero arbitrio*) his new doctrine of grace in the *Confessions* in detail: his own life was to substantiate his theology (see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 112–114). The pre-Augustinian tradition of a Christian apology connected with an account of one's spiritual journey is traced by V.H. Drecoll, who comes to the conclusion that the *Confessions* can be regarded as a "Christian protreptic with an apologetic tendency" and, among others, also as a "paradigm of the doctrine of grace" (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 263–268). J. Lössl also relates the *Confessions* to Augustine's doctrine of grace, though not regarding it as an illustration of it, but as an attempt to deepen his (and the reader's) *intellectus gratiae* (see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 211).

<sup>7</sup> As V.H. Drecoll noticed, the expression *gratia* is not particularly frequent or of key importance in the *Confessions*: there are only twenty-six occurrences in the theological meaning, many of which appear in the sense of accepting baptism or generally for the state of salvation, rarely in the Pauline sense and only exceptionally in the sense of the forgiveness of sins or help in the struggle with desires. Of much greater importance (especially in *Confess.* I–VI) is the expression *misericordia* (which already appears in *Simpl.* I,2; see above, chap. II.1.2, n. 34), which shows God as gracefully present and acting, but also allows for the dialectic of mercy and punishment (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 251–255 and 273–275).

<sup>8</sup> This biblical line, from which only the first part is quoted in the introductory prayer (I,1: CCL 27, 1), reappears in the course of the *Confessions* several times (see IV,3,5: CCL 27, 42; IV,15,26: CCL 27, 53; VII,9,13: CCL 27, 101; X,36,59: CCL 27, 187). On the theme of humility in the *Confessions*, see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 115–118.

*ipsum eum vocabo*). But how could God, who encompasses everything and is wholly present everywhere without being encompassed by anything, enter a place where he has not been yet? How could God, who does not change or diffuse, newly fill the human heart and change it in any other way than by raising men, converging them to himself as the immutable one who changes everything, and letting them rest in himself?<sup>9</sup>

## 2.2. *Evil for Evil Itself* (Confessiones II–VII)

Augustine will return later to this paradox of God's presence in men and the rest of men in God in the conclusion of his work, and, as we will see in the course of his thoughts, it is one of the key themes. For the time being, however, the chain of his narrative presents a man who enters this "dying life or living death" not knowing whence,<sup>10</sup> but undoubtedly already with an insuperable disposition to sin. In Augustine's opinion, not even a one-day-old child is without sin (cf. Job 14:4–5 LXX; 25:4), for it was even conceived in sin (cf. Ps. 50:7 [51:5]). As an infant it is jealous of its foster-brother,<sup>11</sup> and as soon as it learns something, it abuses it (e.g. for play).<sup>12</sup> "So tiny a boy" Augustine was, and already he was "so great a sinner" himself (*tantillus puer et tantus peccator*).<sup>13</sup> The presentation of innate and further multiplied sinfulness culminates in Augustine's analysis of sin as moral evil "for its own

---

<sup>9</sup> See *Confess.* I,2,2–5,6: CCL 27, 1–3. In terms of the doctrine of grace, the introductory prayer (esp. I,1,1) has drawn the attention of J.P. Burns, who perceives it as an expression of "natural desire for God and its dependence upon the preaching of the gospel", i.e., an association of the philosophical search for the truth with Pauline theology, typical of the whole work (J.P. Burns, *Development*, 45). On the other hand, J. Lössl points out that without God's initiative, God cannot be searched for, let alone found (see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 226). The notion of God, who is not locally extensive or corporeal, which Augustine found in Platonism and which brought about a crucial change in the ideas he had maintained until then, is discussed in length by V.H. Drecoll, who, nevertheless, still detects in his thinking a "stoic-Manichaeian notion of God as the all-determining centre". In his *Confessions*, Augustine seeks to answer the question of how this God influences human action (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 283). I. Bochet emphasises the theme of interiority as the finding of one's own, i.e., integrated, identity given by God (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 293–308).

<sup>10</sup> See *Confess.* I,6,7: CCL 27, 4.

<sup>11</sup> See *Confess.* I,7,11–12: CCL 27, 6f. As J.P. Burns points out, these remarks made by Augustine do not have to imply the notion of hereditary sinfulness in terms of guilt, but rather the universal unavoidable disposition to sin, which immediately passes to a personal act (see J.P. Burns, *Development*, 48f.).

<sup>12</sup> See *Confess.* I,10,16: CCL 27, 9.

<sup>13</sup> See *Confess.* I,12,19: CCL 27, 11,12 f.

sake" (*gratis malus*,<sup>14</sup> *gratuito malus*<sup>15</sup>), which he committed at the age of sixteen when he and his friends stole pears from a tree, not for the pleasure of their taste, but of the theft itself. He had "no motive for my wickedness except wickedness itself" (*ut ... malitiae meae causa nulla esset nisi malitia*),<sup>16</sup> being pleased to do "what was illicit for no reason other than that it was not allowed", to break the law for the sake of the transgression itself.<sup>17</sup> The experience made it possible for him to look into the darkest depths of sin, not concerned with an abuse of some good or unbridled desire for it any more, but with evil for the sake of the evil itself. Yet if this is the true nature of the human condition, then men cannot attribute it to their own powers should grace protect them from certain sins:

I attribute to your grace and mercy that you have melted my sins away like ice (cf. Ecclus. 3:17). I also attribute to your grace whatever evil acts I have not done. What could I not have done when I loved gratuitous crime (*gratuitum facinus*)?<sup>18</sup>

It is in this vein that Augustine gives his further account of his affiliation of nine years with Manichaeism, the agony brought about by the death of a close friend, the illegitimate relationship with his mistress, and the birth of their son. By his faults and misdemeanours, Augustine added many a sin to "the chain of original sin by which in Adam we die" (*originalis peccati vinculum, quo omnes in Adam morimur*).<sup>19</sup> All his wanderings notwithstanding, God's mercy did not forsake him; instead, it followed him faithfully from "afar" (*a longe*),<sup>20</sup> or rather, God was "within, but I outside".<sup>21</sup> What did not leave him, either, was the concern and prayers of his pious mother, who left Africa for Italy in order to see to the legitimate marriage of her lost son

<sup>14</sup> See *Confess.* II,4,9: CCL 27, 22,17.

<sup>15</sup> See *Confess.* II,5,11: CCL 27, 23,26.

<sup>16</sup> See *Confess.* II,4,9: CCL 27, 22,16f.

<sup>17</sup> See *Confess.* II,6,14: CCL 27, 24. L.C. Ferrari seeks to explain the importance Augustine attributes to the episode with the pears by means of the symbolism of the tree of transgression from Genesis 3, and by means of the importance which Manichaeism ascribed to the proper eating of fruit, in which, as they maintained, divine particles were imprisoned (see L.C. Ferrari, "The Pear-Theft in Augustine's Confessions", in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 233–242).

<sup>18</sup> *Gratiae tuae deputo et misericordiae tuae, quod peccata mea tamquam glaciem soluisti. Gratiae tuae deputo et quaecumque non feci mala: quid enim non facere potui, qui etiam gratuitum facinus amavi?* (*Confess.* II,7,15: CCL 27, 25). English translation by H. Chadwick, 32.

<sup>19</sup> *Confess.* V,9,16: CCL 27, 66,3f.

<sup>20</sup> See *Confess.* III,3,5: CCL 27, 29,1.

<sup>21</sup> See *Confess.* X,27,38: CCL 27, 175,12.

and his baptism. However, Augustine does not yet perceive his resolution to get married and receive baptism as a return to Christianity.<sup>22</sup> The path to the Milanese garden of his conversion was to lead across the discovery of the “books of the Platonists” and their idea of God as incorporeal and transcendent,<sup>23</sup> across the reading of the letters of the apostle Paul and his “commendation of grace” (*commendatio gratiae*)—i.e., his reminder that men only have what they received, that every man is split between “the law of his mind” and “the law of sin, which is in his members” (Rom. 7:23)<sup>24</sup>—and across the narration of the famous conversions of the rhetorician Marius Victorinus, Saint Anthony, and imperial officers.<sup>25</sup>

### 2.3. *Conversion* (Confessiones VIII)

The models given above awakened Augustine’s desire to join them in the dedication to a pious life (*vacare Deo*), but his resolution was constrained by his own will as a chain (*ligatus non ferro alieno, sed mea ferrea voluntate*). Augustine describes his condition prior to the conversion to an ascetic life as a struggle between two wills (*duae voluntates*), “the old and the new, the one carnal, the other spiritual”, as we know it from the previous analyses of this issue. The “old” will originated in the accomplishing of one’s own desires (*libido*), petrified into a habit (*consuetudo*), which went on to create necessity (*necessitas*) and a “hard bondage” (*dura servitus*) or the “law of sin”. The “new” will, motivated by philosophical and biblical reading and the models of Christian conversions, i.e., the resolution “to worship God for his own sake” (*ut te gratis colerem*, cf. Job 1:9), was still too weak to conquer the unpropitious habit:

<sup>22</sup> See *Confess.* VI,13,23: CCL 27, 89.

<sup>23</sup> According to J.P. Burns, by reading Cicero and getting to know the Platonising allegorical exegesis of Ambrose, Augustine first set himself free from the material concept of God and then, thanks to Paul’s theology, came to long to set himself free from the imprisonment of “carnal customs” (see J.P. Burns, *Development*, 46). The role of Augustine’s notion of God employed in the whole account of his conversion is also emphasised by V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 275–298.

<sup>24</sup> See *Confess.* VII,21,27: CCL 27, 110f. This “commendation of grace” is described by Augustine as a kind of a complementary corrective of his experience with the “books of the Platonists” and his “Platonic” search for God on the path of the spiritual ascent (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 297f.).

<sup>25</sup> These narratives as *exempla* with respect to their role in Augustine’s conversion are accentuated e.g. by I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 281–286.

The enemy had my power of willing in his clutches, and from it had forged a chain to bind me. The truth is that lust (*libido*) springs from a perverted will; when lust is pandered to, a habit is formed; when habit is not checked, it hardens into compulsion (*necessitas*). These were like interlinking rings forming what I have described as a chain, and my harsh servitude used it to keep me under duress. A new will had begun to emerge in me, the will to worship you disinterestedly (*gratis*) and enjoy you, O God, our only sure felicity; but it was not yet capable of surmounting that earlier will strengthened by inveterate custom. And so the two wills fought it out—the old and the new, the one carnal, the other spiritual—and in their struggle tore my soul apart.<sup>26</sup>

Just like the “man under the law” in Romans 7<sup>27</sup> from his answer to Simplicianus, Augustine fluctuated in the midst of the two wills (*ego in utroque*); as he said, “I was rather enduring them against my will (*patiebar invitus*) than acting willingly (*quam faciebam volens*)”.<sup>28</sup>

It was in this state, over the codex of the letters of Paul, that the scene of his conversion occurred;<sup>29</sup> or rather, that Ponticianus’ visit and his account of paradigmatic Christian conversions occurred which made Augustine see

---

<sup>26</sup> *Velle meum tenebat inimicus et inde mihi catenam fecerat et constrinxerat me. Quippe ex voluntate perversa facta est libido, et dum servitur libidini, facta est consuetudo, et dum consuetudini non resistitur, facta est necessitas. Quibus quasi ansulis sibimet innexis—unde catenam appellavi—tenebat me obstrictum dura servitus. Voluntas autem nova, quae mihi esse coeperat, ut te gratis colerem fruique te vellem, Deus, sola certa iucunditas, nondum erat idonea ad superandam priorem vetustate roboratam. Ita duae voluntates meae, una vetus, alia nova, illa carnalis, illa spiritalis, confligebant inter se atque discordando dissipabant animam meam* (*Confess.* VIII, 5,10: CCL 27, 119f.). English translation after M. Boulding, 192f. The anti-Manichaean purport of Augustine’s account is mentioned by many authors; see e.g. V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 301–306.

<sup>27</sup> On the role of Rom. 7:22–25 in the account of Augustine’s conversion, see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 225–228.

<sup>28</sup> See *Confess.* VIII, 5,11: CCL 27, 120. This schism is interpreted by J. Lössl as a discrepancy between the level of knowledge and the level of practice: while the *intellectus gratiae* has already been reached on the former level, it has not yet asserted itself on the latter. J. Lössl makes the conclusion that according to Augustine, grace consists of two components: the cognitive and the ethical one (see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 222). While this conclusion may be right, Augustine himself does not describe his situation before the “conversion” as a schism between knowledge and practice, but distinctly as a struggle of two wills. On the Platonic parallels of this split of the will, see J. Rist, “Love and Will. Around *De Trinitate* XV,20,38”, in: J. Brachtendorf (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild. Augustins De Trinitate im Spiegel gegenwärtiger Forschung*, Paderborn 2000, 205–216.

<sup>29</sup> On this scene in its individual aspects and its possible literary inspirations, see P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions*, 89–197 (with respect to our theme, see esp. 119–125, the comparison with Cyprian’s account of his conversion in *Ad Donatum*, 3–4: CCL 3A, 4f.). The historicity of this scene in all its details has been questioned several times, particularly because of its

clearly his own wretchedness.<sup>30</sup> He especially realised the pitiable weakness of his new will, his mind which “resists itself”, which “orders itself to will, and would not give the command if it did not will, yet does not perform what it commands” (*Imperat ..., ut velit, qui non imperaret nisi vellet, et non facit quod imperat*).<sup>31</sup> In this state of mind, Augustine grasps the children’s rhyme, *Tolle, lege, tolle, lege!*, which he can hear in the vicinity, as a divine oracle inviting him to open and read the codex of the letters of Paul. The apostle’s words, urging one to renounce immorality and put on Christ (Rom. 13:13–14), speak directly into his schism in support of the shamefully weak “new” will.<sup>32</sup> Augustine finally decides to give up his career as a rhetorician, his forthcoming marriage and all provisional relationships, and to dedicate his life to God.

From Augustine’s own account, God turned Augustine towards himself (*convertisti me ad te*),<sup>33</sup> but he also perceives the event as the awakening of his own decision (*evocatum est in momento liberum arbitrium meum*) through his turning away from his own (old) will to the divine will (*nolle, quod volebam, et velle, quod volebas*).<sup>34</sup> His mind was set free from its powerlessness when it came to find more delight in God’s “sweetness” (*suavitas*) than in its previous pleasures:

---

absence in Augustine’s older accounts of his conversion (see *De beata vita* 1,4: BA 4/1, 56–58); P. Alfarić regarded it as no less than Augustine’s attempt to conceal the true nature of his Neoplatonic conversion at that time (see P. Alfarić, *L’évolution intellectuelle*, 391–399). Despite the fictitious rhetorical moments in his narrative, Augustine probably had in mind a datable turn in his life with which he linked his decision to take up Christian ascetism (see P. Courcelle, *Recherches*, 188–202; idem, *Les Confessions*, 191–197; on the summary of the discussion, see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 266–280). According to H.-V. Drecoll, it is possible to find a narrative layer and a layer of reflection in Augustine’s account; he distinguishes four layers in total: (1) the direct narrative level, i.e., the account of the events culminating in the garden scene; (2) the indirect narrative level, i.e., the account of the Christian conversions; (3) the inner level, i.e., Augustine’s description of his own thoughts and feelings; (4) the level of the present discussion, i.e., the association of the narration with the present situation (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 300 f.). I. Bochet emphasises the central position of the paradigmatic narration between the individual experience and theological exposition; in her opinion, it is a presentation of Augustine’s new self-understanding in the light of his reading of the letters of Paul, which is also meant to help his readers to find a new identity (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 291–293).

<sup>30</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,7,16: CCL 27, 123.

<sup>31</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,9,21: CCL 27, 126.

<sup>32</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,12,29: CCL 27, 131.

<sup>33</sup> See *Confess.* VIII,12,30: CCL 27, 132.

<sup>34</sup> See *Confess.* IX,1,1: CCL 27, 133.

How sweet did it suddenly seem to me to shrug off those sweet frivolities, and how glad I now was to get rid of them—I who had been loath to let them go! For it was you who cast them out from me, you, our real and all-surpassing sweetness. You cast them out and entered yourself to take their place, you who are lovelier than any pleasure (*omni voluptate dulcior*) ...<sup>35</sup>

This narration seems to be a good illustration of Augustine's doctrine of grace. Because of its inherited propensity to sin and the enslaving habit, the human will is not capable of doing good even if it knows what it consists in (the way to this knowledge, too, was set up by grace; the contribution of man only consisted in pitiable wandering). It gets into a painful contradiction with itself, one which it cannot overcome. Only with the help of grace can the will efficaciously want what it resolved to do. But even the wanting itself is God's gift, and so is the consent to one's own good will, as we know from the answer to Simplicianus. It is only grace that can make the will find delight in good and more "sweetness" in God than in other delights.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> *Quam suave mihi subito factum est carere suavitatibus nugarum, et quas amittere metus fuerat, iam dimittere gaudium erat. Eiciebas enim eas a me, vera tu et summa suavitas, eiciebas et intrabas pro eis omni voluptate dulcior ...* (*Confess.* IX,1,1: CCL 27, 133). English translation by M. Boulding, 209.

<sup>36</sup> Many scholars regard the whole of Augustine's *Confessions*, and the account of his conversion in particular, as a "paradigm of the doctrine of grace", according to which God's grace overcomes the split of the human will (see A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*, 154–171; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 120 f.; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 299–324; I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 286–291; C.P. Mayer, "Augustinus—*Doctor Gratiae*. Das Werden der augustinischen Gnadenlehre bis zur Abfassung der *Confessiones*", in: N. Fischer (ed.), *Freiheit und Gnade in Augustins Confessiones. Der Sprung ins lebendige Leben*, Paderborn 2003, 37\*–49\*). J.P. Burns, too, finds in the *Confessions* an illustration of the doctrine of grace from the answer to Simplicianus. In accordance with his interpretation of this work, in the *Confessions* and in the scene of the conversion he nevertheless accentuates not only the intervention of God's grace, but also the role of the natural human longing for God and the human personal disposition and decisions (J.P. Burns, *Development*, 47 f.). On the contrary, K. Flasch perceives the scene as evidence of the fact that grace now (after the answer to Simplicianus) works as a sudden, unpredictable gift (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 108 ff.). Similarly, V.H. Drecoll points out that the "conversion" is not concerned only with the achievement of insight, to which the will goes on to give its consent; it is rather the fruit of grace, which prepares the external circumstances and incites the will (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 322 f.). On the interpretation of grace as *intellectus*, see J. Lössl, *Intellectus, passim*. G. Lettieri rightly interprets not only *Confess.* I–X in terms of the newly found teaching on grace, but also XI–XIII, in which he places special emphasis on the motif of predestination (see G. Lettieri, *L'altro Agostino*, 151–204).

2.4. "Grant What You Command, and Command What You Will"  
(Confessiones IX–X)

The situation of a man "under grace", i.e., his own situation after conversion and, consequently, the acceptance of baptism, is also related by Augustine as a struggle, yet a victorious one. Continence (*continentia*), to which he has resolved himself, has always been so difficult for him that he does not hope to persevere except through God's gift.<sup>37</sup> With God's aid it is nevertheless possible to succeed even in this formidable task: "Grant what you command, and command what you will." (*Da quod iubet et iube quod vis.*)<sup>38</sup> This sentence appears in Augustine's reflections on his present situation, still endangered by the "snare of concupiscence" (*laqueus concupiscentiae*),<sup>39</sup> like a refrain. As for drunkenness (to which he is nevertheless not partial), Augustine also asks: "Strengthen me that I may have this power (Phil. 4:13). Grant what you command, and command what you will ... it is by your gift that your command is kept" (*te dare, cum fit quod imperas fieri*).<sup>40</sup> By the same token, moderation with respect to the human tongue and to vainglory is God's gift as well (for men often glory in having given up glory<sup>41</sup>): "In this respect also you command us to be continent: grant what you command, and command what you will."<sup>42</sup>

Into this sentence, which later worried his Pelagian opponents, Augustine seems to have put his notion of Christian existence:<sup>43</sup> even after their conversion, men are still dependent on God's grace if they are to fulfil the principles of a virtuous life. They are not capable of it on their own, but they

<sup>37</sup> ... *neminem posse esse continentem, nisi tu dederis* (Confess. VI,11,20: CCL 27, 87) Cf. Wisd. 8:21.

<sup>38</sup> See Confess. X,29,40: CCL 27, 176. English translation by H. Chadwick, 202.

<sup>39</sup> See Confess. X,31,44: CCL 27, 178.

<sup>40</sup> See Confess. X,31,45: CCL 27, 178 f. English translation by H. Chadwick, 206.

<sup>41</sup> See Confess. X,38,63: CCL 27, 190.

<sup>42</sup> See Confess. X,37,60: CCL 27, 188. English translation by H. Chadwick, 214.

<sup>43</sup> The importance of this sentence (see also above, chap. 1.1.3 incl. n. 35) in the controversy is attested to by Augustine himself (see *De dono pers.* 20,53: BA 24, 730). See also J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 210; P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 122 and 128 f., who gives a survey of its occurrence throughout the whole of Augustine's work (593 f.). According to P. Brown, it was not this sentence alone that upset Pelagius in the tenth book of the *Confessions*, but Augustine's testimony concerning the fact that Christian existence (not only a man before his conversion to Christianity) succumbs to temptation. Augustine thus diverged from the notion of Christian conversion as complete "discontinuity" with one's past, while the Pelagians wanted to defend the notion (which was also present in the older Christian tradition); see P. Brown, "Pelagius and His Supporters: Aims and Environment", in: idem, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972, 199 f.



may succeed with the help of grace. They may even succeed in fulfilling any task, no matter how difficult, if God gives them the power. "Grant what you command, and command what you will."

What was it that changed in Augustine's heart after his conversion? How is it that God now endows him with power he did not have before? What does it actually mean that he "loves his God"?<sup>44</sup> Where did he find his God? In his memory (*memoria*) perhaps? But how could God be in his memory if God cannot be encompassed by anything? Yet if he were not there, how could we find him?<sup>45</sup> How would it be possible to seek him at all if we did not know him already? Perhaps we know him in the manner of the desire for happiness which everyone seeks. But why do we seek happiness? Is it on the ground of a memory (*recordatio*)? From where do we know a happy life? Have we known it before, or is it a memory of the human race extending back to before Adam's fall?<sup>46</sup> Or do we know a happy life in the form of a desire for joy, namely the joy of God for his own sake? For the joy of those who worship him for his own sake (*gratis colunt*) is God himself—and that is also a happy life.<sup>47</sup> In order to have the desire, however, God would have to be in our memory before we knew him—and yet he exceeds our memory for otherwise he would not arouse its desire to exceed itself.<sup>48</sup> To come to this God is, according to Augustine, possible only through a mediator between God and men, who is similar to both, sharing mortality with men and justice with God. He is a mediator who himself is both a winner (*victor*) and a victim (*victima*), a priest (*sacerdos*) and a sacrifice (*sacrificium*); moreover, he is a winner and a priest because he became a victim and a sacrifice in order to turn us from slaves into free sons.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>44</sup> See *Confess.* X,6,8: CCL 27, 159.

<sup>45</sup> See *Confess.* X,17,26: CCL 27, 169. On the theme of finding God in memory, see J. Brachtendorf, *Die Struktur des menschlichen Geistes nach Augustinus. Selbstreflexion und Erkenntnis Gottes in "De Trinitate"*, Hamburg 2000, 42 f.; 112–117 and 245 ff.

<sup>46</sup> See *Confess.* X,20,29: CCL 27, 170 f.; *Confess.* X,21,31: CCL 27, 172.

<sup>47</sup> See *Confess.* X,22,32: CCL 27, 172. Worshipping God for his own sake (*colere te gratis*) is also mentioned by Augustine as the essence of piety in *Confess.* XIII,15,17: CCL 27, 251. See also below, chap. II.3.2.

<sup>48</sup> See *Confess.* X,24,35–37: CCL 27, 174 f.

<sup>49</sup> See *Confess.* X,42,67–43,69: CCL 27, 192 f. V.H. Drecoll regards the search for God in *Confess.* X and its Christological culmination as Augustine's criticism of Neoplatonism: not only of the identification of the contemplating one and the one contemplated in Plotinus (*Enn.* III,8[30],8–9), but also Neoplatonic theurgic practices (it is perhaps the evidence of the beginning of Augustine's coping with Porphyry, as it will be later elaborated on in *De civ. Dei* X); see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 332–339.

One day, Augustine believes, he will cleave to God wholly (*inhaesero tibi ex omni me*), and God will fill his whole life (*vita mea tota plena te*). The reason why it is not so yet is because he is still a burden to himself (*oneri mihi sum*) and he has to struggle with himself incessantly (*sine ullo interstitio*). Only when the resistance is over will he enter divine peace.<sup>50</sup>

Augustine gets to know the taste of eschatological happiness together with his mother shortly before her death in Ostia: in their dialogue they gradually raise their minds from external things to the mind itself, and after transcending the mind, in a beatific vision for a moment they reach “that region of unfailing plenty”, i.e., the very immutable wisdom from which all past and future comes, but which remains as the pure present.<sup>51</sup>

Human happiness, experienced now only in fleeting flashes, in Augustine’s opinion means being filled wholly with God and ceasing to resist his influence by adhering to one’s own unpropitious habits. God has always been in the human heart, has even been closer to it than the heart itself (*interior intimo meo*), although he simultaneously exceeds everything the human heart knows (*superior summo meo*).<sup>52</sup> “Finding God” then means that a human being realises his presence and lets it hold (subordinating one’s will to God) as something that does not come out of one’s heart, but exceeds it, thus raising one to God. God’s original presence in the heart of man, manifesting itself in the desire for happiness, is therefore to be intensified into a conscious human reception of this presence which also raises men above themselves.

## 2.5. *Eternity and Time* (*Confessiones XI–XIII*)

This raises the question of how one can imagine God, who abides as immutable and eternal, but is also present and can be found in human hearts. Augustine reverses it; how can the infinite God encompass finite beings

<sup>50</sup> See *Confess.* X,28,39: *CCL* 27, 175 f.

<sup>51</sup> See *Confess.* IX,10,23–25: *CCL* 27, 147 f. The discussion related to this famous passage is summarised by V.H. Drecoll, who emphasises the importance of dialogue and the verbal medium in the whole event, together with its Christological outcome, which was not present in the earlier “Neoplatonic” ascents to God in *Confess.* VII,10,16 (*CCL* 27, 103 f.). Augustine’s narration of his mother Monica (*Confess.* IX,8,17–13,37: *CCL* 27, 143–154) represents a kind of a paradigm of Christian existence and, at the same time, a certain counterpart to the knowledge of God through the “books of the Platonists” (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 324–328).

<sup>52</sup> See *Confess.* III,6,11: *CCL* 27, 33.

and be encompassed in them?<sup>53</sup> In this form, I believe, this question gave an incentive to the last three books of Augustine's *Confessions*.<sup>54</sup>

There is no past or future in divine eternity, but only the present. The human past and future (for us, the future passing through the fleeting present to the past) are created and set on their course (*creari et excurrere*) by eternity, in which everything is present simultaneously. In this respect, eternity "dictates" (*dictet*) the future and the past.<sup>55</sup> Is there a mind to which all that is past and future is known in the way a song is known to us (a song the beginning of which we remember and the rest we foreknow)? In other words, is there a mind (different from God) which encompasses all time as time, not as the eternal present, devoid of span and change?<sup>56</sup> In this question, left unanswered, Augustine's analyses of time in the eleventh book of his *Confessions* culminate. With respect to our theme, it is not important whether Augustine shared the Platonic doctrine of a "world soul" as a mind expanding into the whole of time,<sup>57</sup> but what we can demonstrate by means of this question is the reason why he was concerned with the relationship between eternity and time in his *Confessions*; how are human destinies, taking place in time, present in eternal God? How is God present in them?

God, as immutable and eternal, does not undergo any changes, and nor does his will, which is identical to his substance, for "whatever he wills, he wills once only and all together and eternally" (*semel et simul et semper velle omnia quae vult*).<sup>58</sup> Therefore the act of creation is not any new will in

<sup>53</sup> See *Confess.* VII,5,7: CCL 27, 96.

<sup>54</sup> V.H. Drecoll holds that the linking theme of the two parts of the *Confessions* is Augustine's newly found notion of God, which copes with both his preceding notions, namely the Manichaeism and Neoplatonic ones. Here Augustine presents God as the giver of grace, who is also the creator; in other words, he develops the parallel between the doctrine of creation and pneumatological soteriology introduced in the allegorical exposition of Genesis 1 in *Confess.* XIII. Redemption thus turns out to be a "pneumatologically mediated renewal of creation on the grounds of predestination" (see V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*, 343–354). I. Bochet regards as the link of both parts the unification of a human being scattered in time into a new identity found through the reading of Scripture (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 308–316).

<sup>55</sup> See *Confess.* XI,11,13: CCL 27, 201.

<sup>56</sup> See *Confess.* XI,31,41: CCL 27, 215 f.

<sup>57</sup> In another of his works from his early episcopal years, Augustine says explicitly that he cannot satisfactorily answer the question concerning the world soul; see *De cons. evang.* I,23,35: CSEL 43, 34 f. What he does know is that God is not the world soul (see *De Gen. litt.* VII,4,6: BA 48, 516), because the world soul would have to be created (*Retract.* I,11,4: CCL 57, 35). For more details, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboul, *L'ordre*, 201–210.

<sup>58</sup> See *Confess.* XII,15,18: CCL 27, 224. English translation by M. Boulding, 321.

God, either.<sup>59</sup> Divine eternity, in which time is established, surely precedes time, though not temporally. “Preceding” (*praecedere*) does not only have a temporal meaning; the flower precedes the fruit in time (*tempore*), and yet by choosing (*electione*) the latter, we can reverse the order. And it is by origin (*origine*) that the sound precedes the tune or formless matter the thing that is formed, i.e., as a medium in which something arises. These three manners of priority differ from the way eternity precedes time (*aeternitate*), i.e., as its timeless ground, condensed into an eternal “now”.<sup>60</sup>

It is probably in the last manner that God “anticipates” (*praevenisti*) all human merits, which are therefore also his own:<sup>61</sup> everything that gradually develops in time is simultaneously condensed in eternity, i.e., with God’s “predestination” (*in praedestinatione ante omnia tempora*) as its ground.<sup>62</sup> On their own, created beings could not even have deserved to arise or turn towards their creator and thus achieve happiness. They owe their lives (*vita*) and happiness (*beata vita*) to God’s grace.<sup>63</sup> God alone let them arise from nothingness, and he alone works the good in men so that they could rest in him at the end of time, i.e., so that he could rest in them, as suggested by God’s rest on the seventh day (Gen. 2:2).<sup>64</sup>

In Augustine’s opinion, however, not all human beings reach the perfect mutuality of God and man. God, who separates the light and darkness (Gen. 1:4), separates the “spiritual” people from the “carnal” ones,<sup>65</sup> among whom we cannot distinguish, but “you, Lord, already know them and have made a division. You called them in secret, before the firmament

<sup>59</sup> See *Confess.* XII,15,18: CCL 27, 225; *Confess.* XII,28,38: CCL 27, 237.

<sup>60</sup> See *Confess.* XII,29,40: CCL 27, 239. The priority of formless matter *origine*, not *tempore*, is mentioned by Augustine several times; see *De Gen. litt.* I,15,29: BA 48, 120; *De Gen. litt.* V,5,16: BA 48, 396; *De Gen. litt.* VIII,20,39: BA 49, 68. He also states that God precedes created things *aeternitate*; see *De Gen. litt.* VI,8,13: BA 48, 464.

<sup>61</sup> See *Confess.* XIII,1,1: CCL 27, 242.

<sup>62</sup> See *Confess.* XIII,34,49: CCL 27, 271.

<sup>63</sup> See *Confess.* XIII,3,4: CCL 27, 243.

<sup>64</sup> See *Confess.* XIII,36,51–37,52: CCL 27, 272. The concluding book of the *Confessions*, which shows the impact of the Holy Spirit on the heart of man, is, according to some scholars, filled with “mysticism” based on Augustine’s doctrine of grace. Without this “mysticism” or living love carried by the Holy Spirit, his teaching cannot be understood properly; see F. Cayré, “Le livre XIII des Confessions”, in: *REAug* 50, 2004, 143–161. Book XIII with its “gnadentheologischen Ergänzungen” (to book XII) is also stressed by C. Tornau, “Augustinus und die intelligible Materie. Ein Paradoxon griechischer Philosophie in der Genesis-Auslegung der *Confessiones*”, in: *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, N.F. 34, 2010, 146 f. incl. n. 143.

<sup>65</sup> See *Confess.* XIII,18,22: CCL 27, 254.

was made".<sup>66</sup> Does Augustine mean by the "secret" (*in occulto*) the hidden human merits which God foreknew and in accordance with which people were divided? His remark concerning the brothers Esau and Jacob (in the polemic against astrology) and the "hidden merits" (*occulta merita*) of human souls, according to which a "secret inspiration" (*occulto instinctu*) of God's justice works,<sup>67</sup> seems to point in this direction. Yet these "deservings", as we already know, are given to men by God himself—for he alone works in men—and men can only accept them as God's gifts on the ground of the will given to them by God. It is therefore the incomprehensible, eternal divine will that decided "before the firmament was made" who would "remain in the permanent bitterness of godlessness" and who would "come into the sweetness" of God's grace.<sup>68</sup> From the "same lump" (*ex eadem massa*) he forms both "us" (as Augustine remarks self-assuredly, for all he has to say about human ignorance of this delicate question), the vessels of honour, and the poor vessels of dishonour:

Who but you can tell them apart? Yet what do we possess that we have not received from you, since from the one same lump you have formed us for honourable service (*in honorem*), and others for dishonour (*in contumeliam*)?<sup>69</sup>

Is this pre-cosmic division, from which various human destinies diverge, determined by God's incomprehensible choice, compatible with the notion of one simple God? Even if God's choice of one group of people and the punishment of the others were in accord with his incomprehensible justice,<sup>70</sup> is it not the case that this diametrically different choice represents a cut in eternity itself? Whether or not we regard as convincing Augustine's relation

---

<sup>66</sup> ... *tu, domine, iam scis eos et divisisti et vocasti in occulto, antequam fieret firmamentum* (Confess. XIII,23,33: CCL 27, 261). English translation by H. Chadwick, 293. The theme of division, which links Augustine's exposition of creation with his notion of election, is accentuated by I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 249–253.

<sup>67</sup> See Confess. VII,6,10: CCL 27, 99.

<sup>68</sup> ... *quis inde venturus sit in dulcedinem gratiae tuae et quis in perpetua impietatis amaritudine remansurus* (Confess. XIII,23,33: CCL 27, 262).

<sup>69</sup> *Quis enim nos discernit nisi tu? Quid autem habemus, quod non accepimus a te, ex eadem massa vasa in honorem, ex qua sunt et alia facta in contumeliam?* (Confess. XIII,14,15: CCL 27, 250). English translation after M. Boulding, 353.

<sup>70</sup> It would certainly have to be a different kind of justice than the retributational one (see e.g. F.-J. Thonnard, "Justice de Dieu et justice humaine selon saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus*, 12 [45–48], 1967, 387–402), yet authors have difficulty demonstrating some "hidden order" in this justice (see A.-I. Bouton-Touboul, *L'ordre*, 407–429).

of God's impact on human destinies, which are simultaneously marked by radical sinfulness, there is no convincing answer to this question in the *Confessions*.<sup>71</sup>

\*\*\*

In his *Confessions*, Augustine employs the story of his own life to illustrate the way in which men are entangled in sin and the conflict of the human will, which is not capable of turning towards good on its own, however much it may wish to. It is God alone who can endow it with the power to fight its paralysis. Whatever men do with God's help, God actually does in them. He himself "grants what he commands". The perichoresis of God's and human action is set in a cosmogonic frame, in which time is the unfolding of eternity and human destinies are the temporal realisation of the divine eternal plan. All that happens in time in the world is at the same time eternally present in God's intention, including the division of men into the chosen ones and the others. God is nevertheless not a passive spectator of worldly events, but an active agent; his "foreknowledge" of human destinies is then tantamount to active support, or to intentional abandonment. Thus in Augustine's notion of God, "foreknowledge" (*praescientia*) must actually be equal to "predestination" (*praedestinatio*).

---

<sup>71</sup> This problem as a "quadrature of the circle" is mentioned by K. Flasch, *Logik*, 63. N. Strand makes an attempt at a solution, arguing that although God's simplicity entails the identity of each of God's qualities (e.g. goodness or justice) with his essence, the simplicity manifests itself on the level of created beings as a plurality of effects, of which the original divine quality is predicated only by analogy. However, this answer on the level of metaphysics does not solve the question of why God diversifies the effect of his justice-goodness in the form of double predestination and why a human being is given one destiny rather than another (see N. Strand, "Augustine on Predestination and Divine Simplicity: The Problem of Compatibility", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 290–305).



### CHAPTER THREE

#### OTHER WORKS FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE EPISCOPATE

In the first fifteen years of his episcopate (before the outbreak of the Pelagian controversy), Augustine wrote a whole range of other works of varied purport, some of which were very extensive.<sup>1</sup> He followed up on the polemic against the Manichaeans in the thirty-three books of *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*<sup>2</sup> and a group of minor works (*Contra epistolam quam vocant fundamenti*,<sup>3</sup> *Contra Felicem Manichaeum*,<sup>4</sup> *De natura boni*, *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum*<sup>5</sup>), and began an exceptionally interesting treatise, *De Trinitate*, in which he expounded, partly in a very original way, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in God (as he presumably finished it after 411, it will be dealt with later). He also wrote or commenced work on several exegetical treatises: he set about (for the fourth time) the exegesis of the book of Genesis (this time, a very detailed one, whose books I–IX

---

<sup>1</sup> The datation of some of these works is the goal of P.-M. Hombert's *Nouvelles recherches*, which brings several new suggestions concerning the traditional chronology of Augustine's works (cf. e.g. P. Brown, *Augustine*, 178–180). However, the method employed by P.-M. Hombert in the datation (the search for parallels of biblical quotations as a chronological clue) does not always have to be reliable because Augustine quoted some biblical lines continually, and even the borrowings from his own works do not have to automatically indicate temporal proximity (see F. Dolbeau, "Les Sermons augustinien de Mayence: bilan des travaux et mise à jour bibliographique (1996–2000)", appendix, no pagination, in: idem, *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence*, Paris 2001; this doubt is shared by e.g. I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 11 n. 20). What is of importance with respect to our topic is that P.-M. Hombert seems to be trying to date all the potential echoes of the Pelagian issues to after 411. However, that puts the doctrine of grace in *Questions for Simplicianus* and the *Confessions* in a strange fifteen-year isolation, which does not seem probable.

<sup>2</sup> On Faustus of Milevis, see F. Decret, *Aspects*, 51–70; on the reconstruction of the work against which Augustine argues, see G. Wurst, "Bemerkungen zu Struktur und Genus litterarium der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 307–324.

<sup>3</sup> On this epistle, see F. Decret, *Aspects*, 106 f.; M. Scopello, "L'*Epistula fundamenti* à la lumière des sources manichéennes du Fayoum", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 205–229.

<sup>4</sup> On Felix, see F. Decret, *Aspects*, 71–89.

<sup>5</sup> On this work, see G. Sfameni Gasparro, "Au cœur du dualisme manichéen: La polémique augustinienne contre la notion de « mutabilité » de Dieu dans le *Contra Secundinum*", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 230–242.



were probably finished before 412<sup>6</sup>), supplied the book of Job with exegetical notes (*Adnotationes in Iob*), continued in the sermonic expositions of the Psalms (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*<sup>7</sup>), started to work on a series of sermons on the Gospel of John (*Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*, sermons 1–16<sup>8</sup>) and expounded the first of the epistles of John (*In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus decem*).<sup>9</sup> In *De consensu evangelistarum* and *Quaestiones evangeliorum* he was concerned with the concord between the Gospels and partial questions related to them. At the same time, he began to work on the treatise on Christian hermeneutics *De doctrina Christiana* (finishing it as late as 426<sup>10</sup>), dealt with several questions of Christian spirituality (*De agone Christiano*, *De fide rerum quae non videntur*, *De opere monachorum*, *De bono coniugali*, *De sancta virginitate*, *De utilitate ieiunii*) and wrote a catechetical treatise, *De catechizandis rudibus*. Several works from this period also reflect an anti-Gentile polemic (the first book of *De consensu evangelistarum*, *De divinatione daemonum*, *Quaestiones expositae contra paganos* = *Ep.* 102).

<sup>6</sup> The datation of this work is not clear. A. Solignac puts its beginning in 399, dating books I–IX before 412, or even 410, and the others to 412 and the following years (see A. Solignac, “Introduction”, in: *BA* 48, 28–30). P.-M. Hombert holds that the work was begun between 404 and 405, interrupted after the passage of III,10,15, and finished between 411 and 414 (see P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 135–188, see also 110–116).

<sup>7</sup> P.-M. Hombert dates the following *Enarrationes* to the period 395–412: *Enarr. Psalm.* 21(2); 30(2) 1–3; 32(2),1–2; 36, 1–3; 40; 42–46; 54; 57; 62; 65–66; 69; 72; 75; 80; 83; 85; 88, 1–2; 90, 1–2; 95–97; 102; 103, 1–4; 106; 110–117; 119–134; 137; 140–141; 145–149 (see P.-M. Hombert, “Augustin”, 218 n. 1; idem, *Nouvelles recherches*, overview 638). According to other scholars, they also include *Enarr. Psalm.* 18(2); 25(2); 31(2); 33; 37; 47; 48; 49; 56; 63; 79; 84; 94; 99; 100; 102 (see M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus*, overview 430–439).

<sup>8</sup> The sermons *In Ioh.* 1–16, marked by the anti-Donatist polemic, may presumably be dated to 406–407 (see A.-M. La Bonnardièrre, *Recherches*, 19–62; M.-F. Berrouard, *Introduction aux Homélies de s. Augustin sur l’Evangile de s. Jean*, Paris 2004, 22–27). M.-F. Berrouard holds that the following sermons *In Ioh.* 17–54 can be dated to 414, with the exception of the *In Ioh.* 20–22 series, which is to be dated to 419–420 (see M.-F. Berrouard, *Introduction*, 79–102); the last group *In Ioh.* 55–124 was “dictated” (i.e., probably not directly preached) from 419 (M.-F. Berrouard, *Introduction*, 177–186).

<sup>9</sup> These sermons may presumably be dated to the Easter period of 407; see A.-M. La Bonnardièrre, *Recherches*, 55f. and the calendar 52f.; older scholars dated this series to the Easter days of 415; see P. Agaësse, “Introduction”, in: *SC* 75, 7–14. All of them agree, nevertheless, that the ten sermons on the First Epistle of John can be dated between Augustine’s treatises 12 and 13 on the Gospel of John. Given the anti-Donatist allusions and the virtual absence of Pelagian issues in the sermons on the Epistle of John, putting the date at 407 seems to be more probable.

<sup>10</sup> See *Retract.* II,4,1: *CCL* 57, 92. On the two redactions of this treatise, see G. Lettieri, *L’altro Agostino*, esp. 429–457.

From these, only some themes will be mentioned, which are already partially known from earlier works, with a special focus on the potential echoes of the new doctrine of grace in the way it was elaborated in the answer to Simplicianus.

### 3.1. *The Anti-Manichaeian Polemic*

#### 3.1a. *The "Merit of Faith" and the Fulfilment of the Law*

Interestingly, in none of the above-mentioned works does Augustine refer explicitly to his new doctrine of the relationship between grace and freedom.<sup>11</sup> In some passages there are even remarks which seem to relate to his older notion from the period of the presbyterate. For example, the reader learns about the "merit of faith (*meritum fidei*), which believes that the Son of God was born as man and suffered for us",<sup>12</sup> and which, as the only human *meritum*, "may be counted worthy" to see the Trinity one day, in which it believes now.<sup>13</sup> We also hear about the merits of a service (*ministerii merita*), for which we are rewarded in the form of "the only thing needed",<sup>14</sup> and yet Augustine does not go on to add quickly that these merits are actually God's own workings (although he realises that the lost son—the

---

<sup>11</sup> That is why the monographs dealing with the development of Augustine's doctrine of grace often end with the answer to Simplicianus (K. Janssen, *Die Entstehung*; A. Zeoli, *La teologia*), or the *Confessions* (A. Niebergall, *Augustins Anschauung*; V.H. Drecoll, *Die Entstehung*), or they switch from these works more or less directly to the Pelagian dispute (P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*). Even J.P. Burns, whose hypothesis of the doctrinal continuity of Augustine's expositions of the letters of Paul, including the answer to Simplicianus, could be substantiated with the works from the beginning of Augustine's episcopate, pays relatively little attention to these works: he deals with some of them together with the *Confessions*, while others are discussed together with the anti-Donatist ones (see J.P. Burns, *Development*, 45–85). J. Lössl deals with the following works as various kinds of "hermeneutics" originating in Augustine's new *intellectus gratiae*: *Contra Faustum* ("anti-Manichaeian hermeneutics"), *De consensu evangelistarum* ("anti-Gentile hermeneutics"), *De catechizandis rudibus* ("catechetical hermeneutics"), *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* ("applied hermeneutics"), *De doctrina Christiana* ("hermeneutics as a theory of science"); see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 146–186 and 196–208. In none of these works, however, is the doctrine of grace from the answer to Simplicianus the theme proper. A valuable overview of Augustine's doctrine of grace in his sermons between 395 and 411 is given by P.-M. Hombert ("Augustin"), who finds here the experience of the author of *Questions for Simplicianus* and the *Confessions*, but not fully-fledged anti-Pelagian issues.

<sup>12</sup> See *Quaest. evang.* I,28: CCL 44B, 23.

<sup>13</sup> See *De catech. rud.* 25,47,7: CCL 46, 170.

<sup>14</sup> See *Quaest. evang.* II,20: CCL 44B, 64; similarly *Quaest. evang.* II,39,2: CCL 44B, 95; *Quaest. evang.* II,8: CCL 44B, 52.

fallen man—is not “according to his merits”, *per merita*, worthy of being his father’s son and begs to achieve it “through grace”, *per gratiam*<sup>15</sup>). Against the Manichaeans, Augustine still defends the freedom of the human will, which turns towards good or towards evil and deserves reward or punishment accordingly<sup>16</sup> (without adding that the good in it is brought on by God alone). At the same time, he speaks of grace, which gives the love without which it is impossible to fulfil the law,<sup>17</sup> and thus does not only command (*iubet*) as the law does, but enables (*iuvet*) the commandment to be fulfilled<sup>18</sup> (and yet he does not go on to say that it is in fact not God’s help for human action, but the action of God himself). Augustine’s notion of the efficacy of grace is Christological-pneumatological (while both these components, known from the period of the presbyterate, were rather lacking in his new doctrine of grace): Christ fulfilled the law in himself (both its rites and its promises),<sup>19</sup> overcoming sin at the same time (for he bore Adam’s body inflicted with mortality as the punishment for sin, and as an innocent one he cancelled the human guilt and punishment).<sup>20</sup> That is why people, as the members of the body of Christ, imitating his humility, can do what their feeble powers cannot: Christ gives us his Spirit,<sup>21</sup> which makes it possible that our “heart is enlarged” with love,<sup>22</sup> thus enabling us to fulfil the law.<sup>23</sup>

### 3.1b. *Adoptive Sonship*

Apart from this notion of the inclusion of the believers into the body of Christ and the “pouring out” of the Spirit, who endows people with love, the theme of adoptive sonship, which we have already encountered, also appears several times in the works from the beginning of the episcopate. Especially with respect to the anti-Manichaean polemic, Augustine makes it clear that becoming the “brothers” of the incarnate Christ as the “first-begotten” (Rom. 8:29) is not tantamount to being of the same nature as God.<sup>24</sup> As Christ is the “only-begotten” Son (cf. John 1:14.18), born of the same

<sup>15</sup> See *Quaest. evang.* II,33,3; CCL 44B, 77.

<sup>16</sup> See *Contra Faust.* II,5: CSEL 25/1, 259; *Contra Fel.* II,4: BA 17, 710.

<sup>17</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XV,4: CSEL 25/1, 423; *Contra Faust.* XVII,6: CSEL 25/1, 489; *Contra Faust.* XIX,27: CSEL 25/1, 529.

<sup>18</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XV,8: CSEL 25/1, 433.

<sup>19</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XIX,8–9: CSEL 25/1, 506 f.; *Contra Faust.* XIX,18: CSEL 25/1, 517.

<sup>20</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XIV,3–4: CSEL 25/1, 405 f.

<sup>21</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XIX,7: CSEL 25/1, 505.

<sup>22</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XII,14: CSEL 25/1, 344.

<sup>23</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XVII,6: CSEL 25/1, 489; *Contra Faust.* XIX,27: CSEL 25/1, 529.

<sup>24</sup> See *Contra ep. fund.* 37: BA 17, 492–494.

divine substance,<sup>25</sup> men, who are created from (*ab*) God, not born of (*de*) him,<sup>26</sup> become sons by being adopted, i.e., they are accepted as sons by God's will or grace.<sup>27</sup> "By nature" (*naturaliter*) they are rather "children of wrath" (*fili i irae*; see Eph. 2:3) or "children of vengeance" (*vindictae filii*), tied by the bond of mortality.<sup>28</sup> What enables them to change for the better is the Word which "was made flesh" (John 1:14),<sup>29</sup> the Son of God, who accepted a body from the "maledictory mass" (*massa ... maledicta*) of the sinful race (*propago peccati*), i.e., mortality, and thus conquered death.<sup>30</sup> He shared God's wrath with men so that they could share God's grace with him.<sup>31</sup> He was born of men so that men could be born of God "by grace". The Word of God was made flesh (*caro*) in order to save the soul which became too entangled in carnality (*carnalis facta*).<sup>32</sup>

By setting men free from sin and death, the Son of God endowed them as his adoptive brothers with a share in his inheritance, i.e., he gained them as his inheritance and became their inheritance himself.<sup>33</sup> The church,

<sup>25</sup> See *Contra Sec.* 5: CSEL 25/2, 911.

<sup>26</sup> In Augustine's opinion the Son is begotten (*genitus*), not made (*factus*) (see *De nat. boni* 24: CSEL 25/2, 866); to give birth or beget (*generare*) then means to create "from oneself" (*de se ipso*) (see *Contra Sec.* 4: CSEL 25/2, 910). In another passage Augustine states that men are not born of God (*natus*) like Christ, or given (*datus*) like the Holy Spirit, but made (*factus*) sons (see *De Trin.* V,14,15: CCL 50, 222). As for the prepositions, the Son of the same substance is born of (*de*) God, while created things only come "from" (*ab*) God (see *De nat. boni* 1: CSEL 25/2, 855). To describe the way in which the "heaven and earth" come from God, Augustine even uses the preposition *ex* (= from, i.e., from his order) (see *De nat. boni* 27: CSEL 25/2, 868). In yet another passage he employs a different criterion: God begat the Son "from himself", while he created the world "from nothing" and man "from something" (i.e., from the earth created before that) (see *Contra Fel.* II,18: BA 17, 744–746). The main difficulty in the communication with the Manichaeans seems to be their undifferentiated usage of the expression "to be from God" (*ex deo esse*) for the human soul (see *Contra Fel.* II,17: BA 17, 740–744).

<sup>27</sup> See *Contra Faust.* III,3: CSEL 25/1, 264 f.

<sup>28</sup> See *Contra Sec.* 5: CSEL 25/2, 912. In Augustine's opinion mortality is a mark of "God's wrath", with which all men are born as their punishment for original sin (see *Enarr. Psalm.* 57,20: CSEL 94/1, 309).

<sup>29</sup> See *De cons. evang.* II,3,6: CSEL 43, 87.

<sup>30</sup> See *Contra Fel.* II,11: BA 17, 728.

<sup>31</sup> *Venit inde Filius non habens peccatum, et indutus est carne, indutus est mortalitate. Si ille nobiscum communicavit iram Dei, nos pigri sumus cum illo communicare gratiam Dei?* (*In Ioh.* 14,13: CCL 36, 150).

<sup>32</sup> *Noli ergo mirari, o homo, quia efficeris filius per gratiam, quia nasceris ex Deo secundum Verbum eius. Prius ipsum Verbum voluit nasci ex homine, ut tu securus nascereris ex Deo. ... ergo caro te caecaverat, caro te sanat. Carnalis enim anima facta erat consentiendo affectibus carnalibus* (*In Ioh.* 2,15–16: CCL 36, 19).

<sup>33</sup> See *In Ioh.* 2,13: CCL 36, 17 f.

regarded as the body of Christ<sup>34</sup> or his bride,<sup>35</sup> can thus also be called his sister—by the Father, not by the mother (for this is the synagogue).<sup>36</sup> At the same time, men become the brothers of Christ or the sons of God on account of their faith in the Son of God,<sup>37</sup> i.e., when fulfilling God's will (Matt. 12:48–50) freely as sons, not as a result of constraint, like slaves.<sup>38</sup> By faith, Christ himself dwells in the human soul: his “eternal power and Godhead” was “united with our weakness and mortality” (*sempiterna virtus eius et divinitas nostrae infirmitati et mortalitati temperata*) and thus opened a way for men from their situation into his own (*de nostro ... in se atque ad se*), giving them the power of virtuous action (*moralis virtutis actio*).<sup>39</sup> In this way, God calls us “that we be not men” (*ne simus homines*), providing we are aware of the very fact that we are just men and have nothing we did not receive.<sup>40</sup> The “deification” (*deificati*) of men is a gift of grace mediated by the Son and identical to their justification.<sup>41</sup>

### 3.1c. *The Gift of Light*

Another of Augustine's images for the efficacy of grace is the notion of Christ as light in which men participate, thus becoming light themselves or the “children of light”.<sup>42</sup> Christ is then the source or principle (*principium*) of light (*lux*), while his disciples are only kindled light, a kind of a

<sup>34</sup> See *De ag. Christ.* 20,22: BA 1, 408. In another passage, Augustine even states that through grace (*per Dei gratiam*) the church gives birth to Christ's body in the way Mary gave birth to Christ as the head of the church (see *De sancta virg.* 5,5: BA 3, 118; cf. also *De sancta virg.* 2,2: BA 3, 112).

<sup>35</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 2,2: SC 75, 154; *Quaest. evang.* I,31: CCL 44B, 25. That is why incarnation is referred to here as “nuptials”, for when Christ “accepted humanity, the church was joined with God” (*in ipso homine suscepto ecclesia Deo copulata est*). Similarly, also *Enarr. Psalm.* 44,3: CCL 38, 495f.; *In Ep. Ioh.* 1,2: SC 75, 116. In his praise of virginity, too, Augustine presents the church as a “virgin espoused unto one Husband Christ” (cf. 2 Cor. 11:2; *De sancta virg.* 2,2: BA 3, 112).

<sup>36</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XXII,39: CSEL 25/1, 632.

<sup>37</sup> See *Quaest. evang.* I,39: CCL 44B, 31; *De cons. evang.* II,4,11: CSEL 43, 93.

<sup>38</sup> See *De ag. Christ.* 7,7: BA 1, 384f.

<sup>39</sup> See *De cons. evang.* IV,10,20: CSEL 43, 417.

<sup>40</sup> See *In Ioh.* 1,4: CCL 36, 2.

<sup>41</sup> *Manifestum est ergo, quia homines dixit deos, ex gratia sua deificatos, non de substantia sua natos. Ille enim iustificat, qui per semetipsum non ex alio iustus est; et ille deificat, qui per seipsum non alterius participatione Deus est. Qui autem iustificat, ipse deificat, quia iustificando, filios Dei facit* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 49,2: CCL 38, 575f.). As far as man is concerned, Augustine also mentions “being a god” in *In Ep. Ioh.* 2,14: SC 75, 180, where it is conditioned by renunciation of the love of the world.

<sup>42</sup> See *De cons. evang.* IV,10,19: CSEL 43, 413.

lamp (*lucerna*).<sup>43</sup> Following up the Manichaeian title of Jesus as the “king of lights”,<sup>44</sup> Augustine makes it clear that the “lights” of human souls cannot be equal to their “king”, who is rather their creator than their brother of the same substance.<sup>45</sup> The human soul in itself is not light (on the contrary, it is darkness in the beginning; see Eph. 5:8<sup>46</sup>), but it can become light if it turns towards God and shines his light (*inluminata lucet ab illo*).<sup>47</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, however, the Manichaeians do not distinguish carefully between God as the source of light and the soul as its mere reflection; moreover, they regard the visible light (the sun) as the godhead itself.<sup>48</sup>

### 3.1d. *God Does Not Depend on Man*

A conspicuous feature of Augustine’s anti-Manichaeian polemic is his challenge to the notion of God as one feeling endangered by the “race of darkness” (*gens tenebrarum*) and therefore sending the souls as parts of himself to fight the darkness. It would be unjust, Augustine holds, to throw the souls through no fault of their own to such misery,<sup>49</sup> not to mention that in accordance with the Manichaeian notion God himself, though not accessible to suffering, would suffer along with the souls. Moreover, the question arises of why the immutable God (for even the Manichaeians regard him as such) should feel endangered by the darkness. And how could the immutable God depend on the fight of the souls with the darkness?<sup>50</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See *De cons. evang.* IV,10,17: CSEL 43, 412. Similarly about John the Baptist (see John 1:8), who is *lumen illuminatum*, not *illuminans* (*In Ioh.* 14,1: CCL 36, 141).

<sup>44</sup> See *Contra Sec.* 3: CSEL 25/2, 908.

<sup>45</sup> See *Contra Sec.* 5: CSEL 25/2, 911 ff.; *Contra Sec.* 7: CSEL 25/2, 915 f.

<sup>46</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 39: CSEL 28/3,3, 623. Similarly *In Ioh.* 2,6: CCL 36, 14; *In Ep. Ioh.* 1,4: SC 75, 120.

<sup>47</sup> See *Contra Sec.* 26: CSEL 25/2, 947.

<sup>48</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XXII,8: CSEL 25/1, 597; *Contra Faust.* XX,6–7: CSEL 25/1, 540 f.

<sup>49</sup> However, Augustine finds a contradiction of the Manichaeian teachings in this question: on one hand, the soul was thrown into darkness through no fault of its own; on the other, it was seduced by free will (*De nat. boni* 42: CSEL 25/2, 878 f.); moreover, as part of God, it would have to be immutable (*Contra Sec.* 9: CSEL 25/2, 917 f.; *Contra Sec.* 24: CSEL 25/2, 942).

<sup>50</sup> See *De ag. Christ.* 4,4: BA 1, 378–380; *Contra Faust.* XIII,6: CSEL 25/1, 384; *Contra Faust.* XX,9: CSEL 25/1, 546; *Contra Faust.* XX,17: CSEL 25/1, 557 f.; *Contra Faust.* XXI,14: CSEL 25/1, 587; *Contra Faust.* XXI,16: CSEL 25/1, 589 f.; *Contra Faust.* XXVIII,5: CSEL 25/1, 742; *Contra Fel.* I,19: BA 17, 694–696; *Contra Fel.* II,1: BA 17, 700–704; *De nat. boni* 42: CSEL 25/2, 876–879. On Augustine’s polemic against the Manichaeian notion of God as victim of the realm of darkness, see F. Decret, “Objectif premier”, 59 ff.; G. Sfameni Gasparro, “Au cœur du dualisme manichéen”.

Although this anti-Manichaean feature is not directly related to Augustine's doctrine of grace, I am convinced that the refuted notion of God as dependent on man could have played a role in Augustine's emphasis on the absolute sovereignty of God's grace, not determined by the human will, in the way it was elaborated in the answer to Simplicianus. God as the "measure" (*summus modus*) of everything is not limited by any "measure".<sup>51</sup> He orders things and imposes structures on them without being limited by these structures: he is a "measure without a measure, a number without a number, weight without weight" (cf. Wisd. 11:21).<sup>52</sup>

### 3.2. *Grace Given Gratis*

(Enarrationes in Psalmos, In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos)

In the first years of Augustine's episcopate, the themes of grace given *gratis* and the corresponding attitudes of reverence and love of God shown *gratis* (i.e., "for his own sake, not for the sake of something else"<sup>53</sup>) reappear in the way we know them from the previous works. The gratuitous aspect of the relationship between God and man seems to be the distinctive feature of Christianity with respect to Judaism, paganism and magic.

According to Augustine, the main Jewish fallacy consists in their effort to fulfil the law on their own and their unwillingness to accept justice "freely" (*gratis*). Yet grace is called *gratia* only because it is given *gratis* (*gratia, quia gratis datur*), not as a reward for previous merits.<sup>54</sup> Salvation is not given on the ground of human merits, but of God's mercy;<sup>55</sup> human beings can only believe in it: "Your justice is your faith."<sup>56</sup> What is important in Augustine's comparison of the regimes of merits and grace is his observation

<sup>51</sup> See *De nat. boni* 22: CSEL 25/2, 864; *Contra Faust.* XXV,2: CSEL 25/1, 727.

<sup>52</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IV,3,7—IV,4,8: BA 48, 288–292. However, we also learn that the number six is not mathematically perfect because it corresponds to the number of days in which the world was created by God, but vice versa: God created the world in six days because it is the first perfect number (*De Gen. litt.* IV,7,14: BA 48, 298), i.e., a number which is equal to the sum of its divisors (2 + 3 + 1); see *De Gen. litt.* IV,2,2–3: BA 48, 280–282. Thus God, the unstructured ground of all structures, seems to respect these structures at the same time.

<sup>53</sup> *Quid est gratuitum? Ipse propter se, non propter aliud* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 53,10: CSEL 94/1, 126).

<sup>54</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),1,6: CCL 38, 194f. Similarly *Enarr. Psalm.* 18(2),2 (CCL 38, 106,23–25): *Quia gratis, ideo gratia. Non est enim gratia, si non gratuita. Quia nihil boni ante feceramus, unde talia dona mereremur.* See further *Enarr. Psalm.* 31(2),7: CCL 38, 230.

<sup>55</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),3,3: CCL 38, 214.

<sup>56</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 32(2),1,4: CCL 38, 249,18: *Fides tua, iustitia tua.*

that in the regime of grace God does not only reward one for winning the fight (like an organiser of a sports match), but strengthens men in the fight itself.<sup>57</sup> The acts men do on the ground of faith are thus not to be attributed to their powers, but to God's grace.<sup>58</sup> As the head of the church of his body,<sup>59</sup> Christ accepts his members as his own, rendering them himself in a kind of "divine commerce" or "divine transaction" (*divina commercia*), in a "wonderful exchange" (*mira commutatio*).<sup>60</sup> That is why their acts are not their own, but are worked by Christ himself<sup>61</sup> as the gift of his grace.

In Augustine's opinion, however, the relation between *gratia* and *gratis* is multivalent: given as *gratuita*, grace can only be given to others for free (*gratis datur, quia gratia vocatur*),<sup>62</sup> and thus it cannot be sold to a man who is not interested in grace itself but in the popularity he expects from it (cf. the request of Simon the Sorcerer in Acts 8:18–24).<sup>63</sup> Grace is passed down for free<sup>64</sup> because the real following of Christ means following him "freely" (for his own sake), not for the sake of a temporal benefit.<sup>65</sup>

Urged by a tempter, Job, as the Old Testament prototype of the righteous one, must prove in his suffering that he "worships God *gratis*" (cf. Job 1:9), for his own sake, not for the temporal benefaction provided by God.<sup>66</sup> It is probably from this biblical passage that Augustine infers that the reverence and love of God means "worshipping and loving God for His own sake, for He himself shall be our whole reward, that we may enjoy His goodness and beauty in that eternal life."<sup>67</sup> God—as the true spouse—should not be loved only for the pleasure he gives us, but for himself:<sup>68</sup> in other words, not for a

<sup>57</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),1,6: CCL 38, 194.

<sup>58</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 31(2),9: CCL 38, 231.

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),1,4: CCL 38, 193.

<sup>60</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),1,3: CCL 38, 192.

<sup>61</sup> ... *quidquid ille operatur per nos, nos videmur operari* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),1,4: CCL 38, 194).

<sup>62</sup> See *In Ioh.* 10,6: CCL 36, 104.

<sup>63</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XXII,48: CSEL 25/1, 640 f.

<sup>64</sup> However, in another passage (*De op. mon.* 7,8: BA 3, 338) Augustine makes it clear that he who preaches gratuitous grace (*gratuitam gratiam*) can be justly rewarded by eating "gratuitously" (*panis gratuitus*); yet it is nobler not to engage in preaching only because of material need (*De op. mon.* 10,11: BA 3, 344–346). In any case, in the apostle's words (2 Thess. 3:8), nobody is to eat *gratis*, i.e., unearned bread (*De op. mon.* 3,4: BA 3, 324).

<sup>65</sup> See *Quaest. evang.* II,10: CCL 44B, 53.

<sup>66</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 55,20: CSEL 94/1, 218 f.

<sup>67</sup> ... *ut ... colatis et diligatis Deum gratis: quia totum praemium nostrum ipse erit, ut in illa aeterna vita bonitate eius et pulchritudine perfruamur* (*De catech. rud.* 27,55,12: CCL 46, 177). English translation after J.P. Christopher, 86.

<sup>68</sup> *Enarr. Psalm.* 34(1),12: CCL 38, 308.



temporary pleasure, but the eternal one, which is he himself; not because he gives other things, but because he gives himself.<sup>69</sup>

“Spiritual grace” given in Christ is thus typical of the Christian era, in which people worship God “for his own sake” (*gratis*);<sup>70</sup> for if they ask God for worldly gifts or bodily rewards (*corporalia praemia*), they are still “under the law”, not yet belonging “to grace” given *gratis*, which can only be responded to by means of love which loves God *gratis*: “If God gave grace (*gratia*) to you, precisely because he gave it gratuitously (*gratis*), love gratuitously (*gratis*). Don’t love God for a reward; he is himself your reward.”<sup>71</sup>

At the same time, “loving *gratis*” is tantamount to loving in the sense of *frui*, i.e., enjoying something as the goal, not in the sense of *uti*, i.e., using something as a means of achieving another goal.<sup>72</sup> According to Augustine’s sermons on the Epistle of John, the end (*finis*) which we search for for its own sake (*propter se et gratis*), not because of something else (*propter aliud*), is only love (*caritas*).<sup>73</sup> Love is presented here as the desire to enjoy God (*ipso frui*),<sup>74</sup> to cleave to God for his own sake (*Deo inhaerere gratis*).<sup>75</sup> The gratuitousness of love makes it different from a slavish attitude, motivated by the fear of punishment, not by the fear of losing love (Augustine illustrates the distinction by means of faithfulness in marriage based on fear on one hand and love on the other).<sup>76</sup> The attitude of love was made possible for man by God himself, who first loved him (see 1 John 4:10)<sup>77</sup> gratuitously, and offered him his love *gratis*.<sup>78</sup> It is only God’s love which makes men worthy of love (“beautiful”).<sup>79</sup> By the same token, men are to love each other not because

<sup>69</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 52,8: CSEL 94/1, 101; *Enarr. Psalm.* 43,15: CCL 38, 487.

<sup>70</sup> See *De catech. rud.* 22,39,3: CCL 46, 163 f.

<sup>71</sup> *Si gratiam ideo tibi dedit Deus, quia gratis dedit, gratis ama. Noli ad praemium diligere Deum; ipse sit praemium tuum* (*In Ioh.* 3,21: CCL 36, 30,27–29). English translation by J.W. Retzig, 92. For the whole passage, see *In Ioh.* 3,21: CCL 36, 30. Similarly also *Enarr. Psalm.* 43,15: CCL 38, 487.

<sup>72</sup> On the distinction *uti*—*frui*, see also e.g. *De doct. Christ.* 1,4,4: CCL 32, 8; *De Trin.* X,11,17: CCL 50, 330. For more details, see R. Canning, *The Unity of Love*, 79–115; A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L’ordre*, 567–579.

<sup>73</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,4: SC 75, 418; *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,5–6: SC 75, 422–424. On this work of Augustine’s, see D. Dideberg, *Saint Augustin et la Première épître de saint Jean. Une théologie de l’agapé*, Paris 1975.

<sup>74</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 9,5: SC 75, 390.

<sup>75</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 9,10: SC 75, 402.

<sup>76</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 9,5–7: SC 75, 388–392.

<sup>77</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 7,7: SC 75, 324.

<sup>78</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 7,10: SC 75, 332.

<sup>79</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 9,9: SC 75, 396–398.

they deserve it, not because they are brothers, but in order to become brothers.<sup>80</sup> According to Augustine, love in this sense bears only good fruit (while concupiscence—*cupiditas*—always bears evil fruit).<sup>81</sup> Therefore, “Love, and do what you will” (*dilige, et quod vis fac*).<sup>82</sup>

Augustine holds that the gratuitousness of God’s action, which constitutes an analogical attitude in men, is made possible by the fact that God’s love does not come from a need,<sup>83</sup> but abundance: such a love he calls *gratior amor*.<sup>84</sup> Men, who were created and renewed “for free,”<sup>85</sup> love God for his own sake and, at the same time, mediate this grace to others for free, not giving what belongs to them, but what they themselves accepted for free.<sup>86</sup> Knowing this does away with their arrogance and makes them grateful (*gratus*),<sup>87</sup> for it would be ungrateful to appropriate something one has been given for free.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, bringing back to God what one has been given by him is the real thanksgiving (*gratias agere*), the real “sacrifice of praise.”<sup>89</sup> Thus, in Augustine’s opinion the etymological connection (*gratia, gratis, gratus, gratias agere*) expresses a whole network of “gratuitous” relations and attitudes.

However, man enters this universe of gratuitousness by means of his faith, which depends on his will: a new birth (unlike the first birth) rests with the will (*in voluntate est*), and so does the growth (differently from physical growth).<sup>90</sup> If men exert their will, God will undoubtedly support them, but how could he help someone who does nothing?

<sup>80</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 8,10: SC 75, 360; *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,7: SC 75, 428.

<sup>81</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 8,9: SC 75, 358.

<sup>82</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 7,8: SC 75, 328. This famous sentence falls into the anti-Donatist context of Augustine’s sermons: in Augustine’s opinion, love (the bond of the church’s unity) is what the Donatists, as schismatics, lack. Their orthodoxy is of no use if they offend against love (the unity of the church); see *In Ep. Ioh.* 9,11: SC 75, 404; *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,1–3: SC 75, 412–414. See J. Gailly, “*Dilige et quod vis fac*. Notes d’exégèse augustinienne”, in: *RechSR*, 43, 1955, 545–555. See also below, chap. II.4.1–2.

<sup>83</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,11,24: BA 49, 46–48.

<sup>84</sup> See *De catech. rud.* 4,7,6: CCL 46, 127. However, as Augustine says in another passage, the Manichaean God gave his members *gratis* to the realm of darkness, meaning perhaps that he did it for no particular reason and through no fault of their own (*Contra Sec. 23: CSEL* 25/2, 941).

<sup>85</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 43,15: CCL 38, 487.

<sup>86</sup> See *In Ioh.* 10,7: CCL 36, 105.

<sup>87</sup> See *In Ioh.* 14,3: CCL 36, 143.

<sup>88</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 55,7: CSEL 94/1, 195.

<sup>89</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 49,21: CCL 38, 591; similarly *Enarr. Psalm.* 44,7: CCL 38, 499.

<sup>90</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 3,1: SC 75, 186.

Still, because you do something by your will, therefore something is attributed to you. ... If you say, "Be you my helper," you do something: for if you are doing nothing, how should he be said to help you?<sup>91</sup>

### 3.3. *Vindication of Grace* (Adnotationes in Iob)

From the works of this period, it is the exegetical annotation of the book of Job that is probably the closest to Augustine's new doctrine on grace. However, as Augustine remarks, rather than being his, this treatise is the work of those who collected his expositions.<sup>92</sup> Here we can read that men "have no merits of their own" (*nullum habere meritum per se ipsos*),<sup>93</sup> and all their good deeds have been "done in God" (John 3:21), not through themselves (*in Deo sunt operata, non in ipsis*).<sup>94</sup> All people are justified by grace;<sup>95</sup> God does take their penitence into consideration, but men are not to take any credit for what they have just accepted, for it is God who works in them "to will and to do" (Phil. 2:13).<sup>96</sup> Like the apostle Paul, Augustine defends grace, which justifies the godless ones,<sup>97</sup> against the inappropriate conclusion that we shall "continue in sin that grace may abound" (Rom. 6:1), for he loves more "whom he forgave more" (Luke 7:42–43).<sup>98</sup> Augustine must defend his notion of grace, which rejects the proud and justifies sinners, not only against the Jews, who are proud of their merits,<sup>99</sup> but now also against some Christians who rely on their good deeds. For his new adversaries, "Paul is the aroma of death, and so they bring about their own death" (*Paulus odor mortis in mortem*; cf. 2 Cor. 2:16).<sup>100</sup>

In this work, Job's piousness is presented as throwing himself into God's hands in reliance on God's justice.<sup>101</sup> Job believes that even the greatest disasters which have afflicted him "were used by God in his justice in the

---

<sup>91</sup> *Tamen quia agis, ibi aliquid voluntate, ideo et tibi aliquid tributum est. ... Si dicis: "Adiutor meus esto," aliquid agis: nam si nihil agis, quomodo ille adiuvat? (In Ep. Ioh. 4,7: SC 75, 234). English translation after H. Browne, 485.*

<sup>92</sup> See *Retract.* II,13: CCL 57, 99f.

<sup>93</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 37: CSEL 28/3,3, 598.

<sup>94</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 36: CSEL 28/3,3, 593.

<sup>95</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 606.

<sup>96</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 37: CSEL 28/3,3, 599f.

<sup>97</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 37: CSEL 28/3,3, 597f.; *Adnot. Iob* 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 606.

<sup>98</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 608.

<sup>99</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 37: CSEL 28/3,3, 598.

<sup>100</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 37: CSEL 28/3,3, 595.

<sup>101</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 23: CSEL 28/3,3, 556.

way he wanted it".<sup>102</sup> He has no reason to bemoan his dreadful lot, for none can say they have suffered unjustly (*inmeritum aliquid, indigne*) or that their suffering comes to a bad end for them. All men deserve punishment for their deeds or words or the arrogance (*temeraria praesumptio*) of their hearts.<sup>103</sup> Their suffering not only punishes them justly, but also removes all illusions of their greatness and power.<sup>104</sup> Nevertheless, Augustine still regards this piety as the "freedom and love of adoptive sons", "cleaving to" (*coniungor*) the Christ-mediator,<sup>105</sup> who himself "bonded with men with the glue of love" (*ut ... cohaereret eis tamquam glutine caritatis*),<sup>106</sup> and thus freed them of the fear of the law.<sup>107</sup>

The two most problematic consequences of Augustine's new doctrine of grace, namely the notion of inherited human guilt and God's predestination independent of human action, are only implied here, which makes it impossible to decide with certainty whether he really draws on the doctrine present in the answer to Simplicianus, or whether he (rather) holds on to his previous teaching. We learn about two types of sin, one "natural, which follows from mortality" (*naturale peccatum de condicione mortali*), the other "voluntary" (*voluntarium*);<sup>108</sup> voluntary sins are further described as the workings of concupiscence (*concupiscentialia*), while natural sin is presented as endowments "through which, on the ground of the sin that has been passed down, men deserved to reach voluntary sins" (*quibus ad haec venire homo meruit ex traduce peccati*).<sup>109</sup> All men die in Adam for his sin, for all people are included in their ancestors.<sup>110</sup> As a punishment, they return to the dust from which they were taken (cf. Job 10:9).<sup>111</sup> As for predestination, Augustine holds that God called (*vocatio*) all the righteous ones simultaneously (*semel*; cf. Job 33:14); yet his providence (*providentia*) realises this calling with individual people in the course of time (*temporaliter circa*

<sup>102</sup> ... etiam calamitate et miseria mea usus est ad iustitiam suam Deus, sicut voluit (Adnot. Iob 30: CSEL 28/3,3, 575,13f.).

<sup>103</sup> See Adnot. Iob 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 600.

<sup>104</sup> See Adnot. Iob 9: CSEL 28/3,3, 529.

<sup>105</sup> See Adnot. Iob 9: CSEL 28/3,3, 531.

<sup>106</sup> See Adnot. Iob 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 614.

<sup>107</sup> See Adnot. Iob 9: CSEL 28/3,3, 531.

<sup>108</sup> ... ne cupiditate terrena maioribus calamitatibus voluntarii peccati operiar, quod est illud naturale peccatum de condicione mortali (Adnot. Iob 16: CSEL 28/3,3, 544).

<sup>109</sup> See Adnot. Iob 36: CSEL 28/3,3, 588.

<sup>110</sup> See Adnot. Iob 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 606.

<sup>111</sup> See Adnot. Iob 10: CSEL 28/3,3, 532.

*singulos hoc agit*).<sup>112</sup> In “predestination” (*in praedestinatione*), i.e., here in his “foreknowledge” (*praescientia*), God sees the path each man will follow.<sup>113</sup>

### 3.4. *Causes Hidden in God* (De Genesi ad litteram I–IX)

In his exposition *De Genesi ad litteram*, Augustine makes a distinction between two forms of divine providence (*bipertitum opus providentiae*):<sup>114</sup> on one hand, God in his goodness creates the natures of things, on the other, being just, he directs (*ordinat*) the wills of rational beings with his power.<sup>115</sup> Yet how does God direct the will? In other words, how does God, who does not move in time or place, set in motion the rational spirit, which moves itself in time and moves the body both in time and place?<sup>116</sup> For one thing, God directs (the good), and for another, he allows (the evil),<sup>117</sup> Augustine replies, and he also assigns the appropriate consequences to the good and evil wills so that “neither the good ones may be unfruitful nor the bad ones go unpunished” (their interior punishment being their very own iniquity).<sup>118</sup> Yet God is not only the “manager” of consequences, nor does he administer things from the “outside” only (*extrinsecus*), but, as their creator, also from the “inside” (*intrinsecus*): he is inside everything and everything is inside him, although he is also raised above everything.<sup>119</sup> He speaks to men “through his own substance” (when he creates and illuminates them) or through a created mediator,<sup>120</sup> administering (*administrat*) at the same time the natural and voluntary movements of all created things.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>112</sup> See *Adnot. Iob* 33: CSEL 28/3,3, 581.

<sup>113</sup> *In praedestinatione dominus vidit viam, quo se converterent tentati. Paravit et investigavit: in praedestinatione, non in actione* (*Adnot. Iob* 28: CSEL 28/3,3, 569). ... *propter eius praescientiam, qui novit etiam nondum humilem quemque conversum iri* (*Adnot. Iob* 38: CSEL 28/3,3, 616).

<sup>114</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,24,45: BA 49, 78; *De Gen. litt.* IX,15,28: BA 49, 130. For more details, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulis, *L'ordre*, 251–253.

<sup>115</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,23,44: BA 49, 74–76; *De Gen. litt.* VIII,9,18: BA 49, 38.

<sup>116</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,21,40–22,43: BA 49, 70–74.

<sup>117</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,24,45: BA 49, 78.

<sup>118</sup> ... *voluntates autem ut nec infructuosae bonae nec impunitae malae sint ... Nam in se ipsis malae voluntates habent interiorem poenam suam eandem ipsam iniquitatem suam* (*De Gen. litt.* VIII,23,44: BA 49, 76). English translation by E. Hill, 371.

<sup>119</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,26,48: BA 49, 82.

<sup>120</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,27,49: BA 49, 84.

<sup>121</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IX,15,28: BA 49, 130–132.

According to Augustine, the natural course of events follows seminal reasons (*rationes seminales*), hidden in things from their creation.<sup>122</sup> There are also other causes, hidden not in things themselves, but only in God as their creator.<sup>123</sup> These causes, known to God alone (*causae in Dei praescientia reservatae*),<sup>124</sup> are efficacious of necessity, while the causes hidden in things are a mere possibility.<sup>125</sup> What God wants will necessarily happen, and what God foreknows becomes real just because he foreknows it. God is not dependent in his foreknowledge on what will happen, but vice versa: things are dependent on the reasons hidden in God's foreknowledge:

For it is what he wills that will of necessity be in the future, and it is those things that he has foreknown which will really be in the future. Many things, you see, will be in the future as determined by lower causes, while if they are also in God's foreknowledge like that, they really will be in the future. ... [A]nd doing so [God] did something, which he had foreknown *before the foundation of the world* (Eph. 1:4) that he was going to do, and which he had reserved to his own will. So he did not do something that was not going to be in the future; on the contrary, this rather was what was going to be in the future, which he had foreknown he was going to do. ... [His] foreknowledge cannot be mistaken. And that is why what he foreknew would of necessity come to pass in the future.<sup>126</sup>

In Augustine's opinion, these hidden reasons (from which events defying the natural course of events follow) also include God's grace (*gratia*), which gives salvation to sinners without considering their merits: the perverted human will cannot rectify itself, but must be supported by grace, which is why no man can regard the return to God as his own merit:

So then, God has in himself the hidden causes of certain deeds and events, which he did not insert in things he had made; and he does not activate them by that work of providence by which he set up natures in order for them to be, but by other one by which he administrates as he may wish the natures he established as he wished. Among these causes too is the grace by which

<sup>122</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IX,17,32: BA 49, 138–140.

<sup>123</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IX,18,33–34: BA 49, 140–142.

<sup>124</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,17,28: BA 48, 488.

<sup>125</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,15,26–16,27: BA 48, 484–486; *De Gen. litt.* VI,18,29: BA 48, 490.

<sup>126</sup> *Hoc enim necessario futurum est, quod ille vult, et ea vere futura sunt, quae ille praescivit; nam multa secundum inferiores causas futura sunt. Sed si ita sunt et in praescientia Dei, vere futura sunt. ... id utique faciens [Deus], quod ante constitutionem mundi se facturum esse praesciebat et in sua voluntate servabat. Non ergo id fecit, quod futurum non erat: hoc enim magis erat futurum, quod se facturum esse praesciebat. ... cuius praescientia falli non poterat. Et ideo quod praesciebat, necessario futurum erat* (*De Gen. litt.* VI,17,28: BA 48, 488). English translation after E. Hill, 395.

sinner's are saved. I mean, as far as a nature distorted by its own wicked will is concerned, it has no recourse in itself, but only in the grace of God, by which it is helped and restored. People should not be despaired of, you see, because of that judgment where it is written: *All who walk in it shall not return* (Prov. 2:19); this was said with regard to the pull of their wickedness, so that the fact that those who will return do return is not something they should attribute to themselves but to God's grace—not *from works, lest any should exalt themselves* (Eph. 2:9).<sup>127</sup>

Thus, while the natural moves of all things that are created follow the seminal possibilities put into things themselves, the voluntary turning towards God follows the hidden reasons in God, which are realised out of necessity. These reasons, i.e., God's knowledge of men and their predestination to salvation, precede the creation of the world (*ante saeculum in praescientia creatoris*; see Eph. 1:4), and hence the creation of man as well. According to Augustine, God knows the destinies of men not only before they are born, but even before the creation of man as such in his "seminal cause".<sup>128</sup>

Grace as the "seminal reason" hidden in God is to develop (like the created seminal reasons of natural things<sup>129</sup>) in the course of time in the

---

<sup>127</sup> *Habet ergo Deus in seipso absconditas quorundam factorum causas, quas rebus conditis non inseruit, easque inplet non illo opere providentiae, quo naturas substituit ut sint, sed illo, quo eas administrat, ut voluerit, quas, ut voluit, condidit. Ibi est et gratia, per quam salvi fiunt peccatores. Nam quod adinet ad naturam iniqua sua voluntate depravatam, recursum per semet ipsam non habet, sed per Dei gratiam, qua adiuvatur et instauratur. Neque enim desperandi sunt homines in illa sententia, in qua scriptum est: omnes qui ambulant in ea, non revertentur. Dictum est enim secundum pondus iniquitatis suae, ut, quod revertitur qui revertetur, non sibi tribuat, sed gratiae Dei, non ex operibus, ne forte extollatur* (*De Gen. litt. IX*, 18, 33: BA 49, 140–142). English translation by E. Hill, 395.

<sup>128</sup> See *De Gen. litt. VI*, 11, 19: BA 48, 472–474; similarly *De Gen. litt. IV*, 9, 19: BA 48, 302; *De Gen. litt. VI*, 9, 14: BA 48, 464.

<sup>129</sup> Augustine's doctrine of creation refers both to the simultaneous (*simul*) constitution of all things according to their species in a kind of embryonic form, and to their gradual "development" in time under God's supervision. This double creation, different from the eternal presence of things in the Word of God, corresponds, according to Augustine's exposition, to the double account from Genesis 1 and Genesis 2: things were first created in their "primordial causes" (*causae primordiales*) or some causal potentialities (*potentialiter atque causaliter, causaliter latentes*), as it is said in the metaphorical relation of the "six days" in Genesis 1; Genesis 2 then introduces the gradual rising of things in the course of time (*per temporalia spatia*) and in visible forms (*formae manifestae*), which has continued until now (see *De Gen. litt. VI*, 5, 7: BA 48, 454; *De Gen. litt. VI*, 10, 17: BA 48, 468; *De Gen. litt. V*, 20, 41: BA 48, 430–432). The primordial "seeds" or "causes", i.e., "things enfolded in their primordial causes" (*involucra primordialia*), which "unfold" in the course of time (see *De Gen. litt. VI*, 6, 9–11: BA 48, 456–458), are presumably identical to the "seminal reasons" inserted into things themselves in the beginning (see *De Gen. litt. IX*, 17, 32: BA 49, 138). For more details, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboul, *L'ordre*, 82–86 and 188–194.

form of a voluntary turning of individual people towards God. This turning, however, given by grace, cannot be separated from its cause. God does not turn men in the way a farmer looks after the earth, which remains cultivated after his activity, or in the way of a doctor whose operation cures the patient as a cause from the “outside”. God rather works in man like light in the air: if the light recedes, the air loses its brightness.<sup>130</sup>

So human beings ought not to turn to God in such a way that when they have been made just by him they take their departure, but in such a way that they may always be made so by him. In the very fact of their not taking their leave of him they are being justified and enlightened and blessed by his presence with them, by God working and guarding them ...<sup>131</sup>

Men thus have to not only turn towards God (*conversio*), but persevere in this turning, and stick to God (*inhaerere Deo*) for good. However, this is made possible by grace, not human efforts:

And so may he who is himself unchangeably good work human beings into being good and guard them. We ought always to go on being made by him, always being perfected by him, sticking to him and persevering in that way of life which is directed towards him. ... The apostle too, when he was commending the grace by which we have been saved to the faithful who had been converted from ungodliness (Eph. 2:8) ..., in case they should think this should be attributed to themselves, as though they would make themselves just and good, immediately added: *for it is God who is working in you* (Phil. 2:13).<sup>132</sup>

Sticking to God actually means (as in Augustine’s example of light and air) being penetrated by God, by means of which everything men do is done by God in them.

God keeps working in what he created, maintaining its being and order, and, on the other hand, man is in God, for “in him we live and move and have our being” (Acts 17:28).<sup>133</sup> Moreover, rational beings are made complete in

<sup>130</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VIII,12,25–26: BA 49, 48–50.

<sup>131</sup> *Non ergo ita se debet homo ad Deum convertere, ut, cum ab eo factus fuerit iustus, abscedat, sed ita, ut ab illo semper fiat. Eo quippe ipso, cum ab illo non discedit, eius sibi praesentia iustificatur et inluminatur et beatificatur operante et custodiante Deo ...* (*De Gen. litt.* VIII,12,25: BA 49, 48). English translation by E. Hill, 362.

<sup>132</sup> *Ille itaque operetur hominem bonum atque custodiat, qui incommutabiliter bonus est. Semper ab illo fieri, semperque perfici debemus, inhaerentes ei et in ea conversione, quae ad illum est, permanentes ... Nam et apostolus cum fidelibus ab impietate conversis gratiam, qua salvifacti sumus, commendaret ..., ne sibi putarent tribuendum, tamquam ipsi se facerent iustos et bonos, continuo subiecit: Deus enim est qui operatur in vobis.* (*De Gen. litt.* VIII,12,27: BA 49, 50). English translation after E. Hill, 362.

<sup>133</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IV,12,23: BA 48, 310.



their voluntary turning towards God, thanks to whom there is “love poured out” in their hearts through the gift of the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom. 5:5). Thus God works in the hearts of men, acts through them and in them he also “rests” (cf. Gen. 2:2), when he allows them to rest in himself.<sup>134</sup> God, always working in his creation, then finds rest in himself when he makes it possible for rational beings to turn to him and rest in him. This “perpetual sabbath”, to which rational beings become attached with their desire (*adpetitus desiderii*)<sup>135</sup> given by God, is entirely God’s gift; it is caused by God alone in man, who does not add anything on his own:

What they do in fact observe in this present time of grace, those who work whatever good they work in the hope of a future rest and who do not boast about these good works of theirs as though they had any good which they had not received (cf. 1 Cor. 4:7), is a perpetual sabbath. ... [A]nd *walking now in newness of life* (Rom. 6:4), they acknowledge that God is at work in them, who both works and rests simultaneously ...<sup>136</sup>

In Augustine’s expositions of the book of Genesis from this period, we can thus find the fully-fledged doctrine of grace in the way it was elaborated in his answer to Simplicianus and in the *Confessions*, namely the notion of God’s impact on the human will and the presupposition of God’s predestination plan (although its double effect is not particularly accentuated). In the notion of inherited guilt, too, it is possible to notice a certain radicalisation. Augustine is aware that all men were included in Adam as the “root” of the whole race (*radicaliter*),<sup>137</sup> and in him they also sinned and they die for this sin;<sup>138</sup> in other words, the sin of the parents is in some way transferred to their descendants.<sup>139</sup> Not even a one-day-old infant is without sin (cf. Job 14:4–5 LXX; 25:4), having even been conceived in sin (Ps. 50:7 [51:5]). Yet whatever “merits” parents pass on to their children and whatever the grace by means of which God sanctifies men before their birth, God is never unjust in his predestination plan. However, Augustine rejects the idea that the souls had sinned in various degrees before they entered the

<sup>134</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IV,9,16–17: BA 48, 300. What God’s creation does through God’s gift, God himself does in a certain respect; see also *Enarr. Psalm.* 52,5: CSEL 94/1, 95–97.

<sup>135</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IV,9,16: BA 48, 300.

<sup>136</sup> *In ea quippe iam gratia perpetuum sabbatum observat, qui spe futurae quietis operatur quidquid boni operatur nec in ipsis bonis operibus suis quasi habens bonum, quod non acceperit, gloriatur; ... ut iam in novitate vitae ambulans Deum in se operari cognoscat, qui simul et operatur et quiescit ...* (*De Gen. litt.* IV,13,24: BA 48, 312). English translation after E. Hill, 255.

<sup>137</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,9,14: BA 48, 464.

<sup>138</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,9,15: BA 48, 466.

<sup>139</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,9,16: BA 48, 466–468.

body and were punished for that<sup>140</sup> (although he cannot say precisely how individual souls arise<sup>141</sup>).

Human life is nevertheless inflicted from the very beginning with an incurable disease (*aegritudo*), which inevitably ends in death (much more inexorably than other terminal diseases, e.g. anasarca or elephantiasis). Augustine places this “disease” into the “body” inflicted with the punishment for sin (*poena peccati*)—for, as the apostle has it, the “members” are ruled by a law contradicting the law of the mind (Rom. 7:23)<sup>142</sup>—even suggesting a relationship between the “disease” and “libidinous” procreation (*ardor libidinis*<sup>143</sup>), which is beyond the control of the human will:

This being so, why should we not suppose that before sin those two human beings were able to control and command their genital organs for the procreation of children in the same way as their other limbs, which the soul moves for all kinds of action without any trouble or any sort of prurient itch for pleasure? ... Now however, as the just deserts of their transgressing the commandment, they found the movement of that law fighting back against the law of the mind in the members of the body of that death they had contracted ...<sup>144</sup>

As we can see, in his reflections on the original situation of human beings before sin, Augustine assumes the possibility of sexual intercourse void of “libidinous” uncontrollability and fully controlled by the will. “Libidinous” sexuality (not sexuality as such) is thus a punishment for sin.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>140</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* VI,9,15: BA 48, 466.

<sup>141</sup> More than once Augustine admits his doubts concerning this question: Does God create children's souls from the souls of their parents, or in a different way (see *De Gen. litt.* IX,11,19: BA 49, 116)? And how was the soul created in the first place? Does it have a primordial cause as well (in the angelic spirit perhaps?), or was it created complete and entered the body later (but why would it do so?). Or perhaps it was created when it was entering the body (but from what, if it does not have a primordial cause?); see *De Gen. litt.* VII,24,35–28,43: BA 48, 558–570. Augustine is also concerned with these problems in the tenth book of *De Genesi ad litteram*, where he is inclined to accept the notion of traducianism, namely that children's souls were created from the souls of their parents, without, however, arriving at a clear conclusion (see below, chap. III.2.1).

<sup>142</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IX,10,17: BA 49, 112. See also *De Gen. litt.* IX,10,18: BA 49, 114; *De Gen. litt.* IX,3,6: BA 49, 96–98.

<sup>143</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* IX,3,6: BA 49, 96.

<sup>144</sup> *Quae cum ita sint, cur non credamus illos homines ante peccatum ita genitalibus membris ad procreandos filios imperare potuisse sicut caeteris, quae in quolibet opere anima sine ulla molestia et quasi pruritu voluptatis movet? ... Nunc vero transgrediendo praeceptum motum legis illius, quae repugnat legi mentis, in membris conceptae mortis habere meruerunt ...* (*De Gen. litt.* IX,10,18: BA 49, 114). English translation by E. Hill, 385f.

<sup>145</sup> See also *De Gen. litt.* IX,10,18: BA 49, 114; *De Gen. litt.* IX,3,6: BA 49, 96–98.

This last theme, which will go on to attract Augustine's attention especially in the last years of his life, crystallises gradually in the works from this period. Not only does Augustine regard the movement of the genitals, which is beyond the control of the will, as a consequence of the human fall, but he even suggests a relationship between "libidinous" procreation and the hereditary transfer of sin. As he says in his Christological expositions, the body of Christ was not "sinful flesh" (*caro peccati*) because it did not arise through a "transfer of mortality" (*ex traduce mortalitatis*) with the participation of a man, but from a virgin.<sup>146</sup> His virgin mother did not conceive him "in sin" (Ps. 50:7 [51:5]), i.e., in a way corresponding to human mortality (*de mortalitate*), but in faith (*fide*). That is why he accepted the body from Adam's race, but not the sin of this "mass".<sup>147</sup> This seems to include not only the notion of "libidinous" procreation as a punishment for sin, but also a causal relation between such procreation and sinfulness passed down to the offspring. On the other hand, unlike the Manichaens, who reject carnal procreation as an imprisonment of the godhead in the body, Augustine emphasises the integrity of marriage producing carnal offspring.<sup>148</sup>

### 3.5. *Grace Excluding Pride* (De virginitate)

Divine predestination, calling, justification and glorification of the saints are discussed in Augustine's treatise on virginity as well, in which he also makes a distinction between the various *merita* of the saints and various intensities of their heavenly reward, i.e., their eschatological glory or light (*diversa lumina meritum*).<sup>149</sup> These "merits" (martyrdom, virginity, and virtuous widowhood or marriage) are only various gifts of divine grace (*divinae gratiae munera*).<sup>150</sup> Like the *Confessions*, this treatise emphasises

<sup>146</sup> *Non erat ergo illa caro peccati, quia non de traduce mortalitatis in Mariam per masculum venerat* (*Contra Faust.* XIV,5; CSEL 25/1, 406). *Praeter hoc vinculum concupiscentiae carnalis natus est Christus sine masculo, ex virgine concipiente de Spiritu sancto. Non potest iste dici in iniquitate conceptus* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 50,10; CCL 38, 606).

<sup>147</sup> *Non enim in iniquitate conceptus est, quia non de mortalitate conceptus est; nec eum in peccatis mater eius in utero aluit, quem virgo concepit, virgo peperit; quia fide concepit, et fide suscepit. Ergo ecce Agnus Dei. Non habet iste traducem de Adam; carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit. Qui non assumpsit de nostra massa peccatum, ipse est qui tollit nostrum peccatum* (*In Ioh.* 4,10; CCL 36, 36).

<sup>148</sup> See *Contra Faust.* XIX,29; CSEL 25/1, 532 f.; *Contra Faust.* XXIX,4; CSEL 25/1, 746 f.; *Contra Fel.* I,7–8; BA 17, 660–662; also *De bono coniug.* 1,1; BA 2, 22 et passim.

<sup>149</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 26,26; BA 3, 158.

<sup>150</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 45,46; BA 3, 204–206.

that continence as the “portion of Angels”<sup>151</sup> is the gift of God (*munus*) (cf. Wisd. 8:21), not a human merit.<sup>152</sup> That is why he who prides himself on this gift as his own work is seriously mistaken. The greater the perfection one has achieved, the more humility one needs to find grace with God (cf. Eccclus. 3:20),<sup>153</sup> for if he found delight in himself, he would displease God, who “resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (James 4:6; cf. Eccclus. 3:34).<sup>154</sup> That is why virgins devoted to God, a “people especially chosen even among the chosen ones” (*genus in electis electius*), are saved through faith as well, not by their works (Eph. 2:8–9).<sup>155</sup> No man is free of all sins,<sup>156</sup> and only with the help of grace (*adiuvante gratia*) and by means of God’s gift and help can men avoid sin and do as God commands: *ea ipsa, quae praecipuntur a Deo, non fieri nisi dante atque adiuvante qui praecepit*.<sup>157</sup> It is with great mistrust that Augustine mentions the idea that it is possible to live without any sin in this life.<sup>158</sup> Men are what they are solely by grace (cf. 1 Cor. 15:10), and yet they must not boast about even this very grace:

Now that men and women know that they are what they are by the grace of God, let them not fall into another trap of pride, by becoming proud even about God’s grace and looking down on others because of that.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>151</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 13,12: BA 3, 128.

<sup>152</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 1,1: BA 3, 110; *De sancta virg.* 41,43: BA 3, 198. Similarly also *De Gen. litt.* IX,11,19: BA 49, 116, where Augustine makes it clear that as a “law of sin in the members” contradicting the “law of the mind” (cf. Rom. 7:23), the carnal lust of the fallen man, which is beyond the control of the will, is the punishment for the sin of the first man and can only be overcome by grace.

<sup>153</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 31,31: BA 3, 168. The biblical line Eccclus. 3:20 is repeated several times; see *De sancta virg.* 33,33: BA 3, 174–176; in an allusion in *De sancta virg.* 37,37: BA 3, 184.

<sup>154</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 34,34: BA 3, 178.

<sup>155</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 40,41: BA 3, 194.

<sup>156</sup> See *De sancta virg.* 48,48: BA 3, 210–212.

<sup>157</sup> *De sancta virg.* 41,42: BA 3, 196.

<sup>158</sup> *Sed non contendo cum eis qui asserunt hominem posse in hac vita sine ullo peccato vivere: non contendo, non contradico* (*De sancta virg.* 50,51: BA 3, 214). This question, which will go on to gain prominence in the anti-Pelagian context (see P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 116–119), draws Augustine’s attention in another passage as a certain “contradiction of the works of John”, in which it is said that nobody is without sin (1 John 1:8), but being without sin is at the same time presented as the evidence of real Christianity (1 John 3:9); see *In Ep. Ioh.* 4,12: SC 75, 240. Augustine replies along the lines that the sin which cannot be committed by the one who was truly “born of God” consists in the violation of love (*In Ep. Ioh.* 5,3: SC 75, 252; *In Ep. Ioh.* 6,5: SC 75, 288). On the “contradiction of the works of John” (“une contradiction de Saint Jean”) in Augustine’s works, see A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 42f.

<sup>159</sup> *Deinde iam sciens homo, gratia Dei se esse quod est, non incidat in alium superbiae laqueum, ut de ipsa Dei gratia se extollendo spernat caeteros* (*De sancta virg.* 43,44: BA 3, 202). English translation by R. Kearney, 97.

In the treatise on virginity, Augustine thus seems to apply some elements from his new doctrine of grace to this partial theme,<sup>160</sup> though without providing an explicit account of the relationship of grace and freedom. The ascetic purport of the text especially sets off the theme of humility as both the prerequisite and consequence of grace.<sup>161</sup> In the answer to Simplicianus, too, one of the themes which were to highlight God's sovereignty was the aim of diminishing the pride of men (men have nothing they "did not receive"; 1Cor. 4:7), and it is very probable that this spiritual motivation played a role in the crystallisation of Augustine's doctrine of grace.

### 3.6. *Grace for Grace*

(Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium 1–16)

Augustine's new doctrine of grace also influenced his exposition of John 1:16, where it is said of the incarnate Son of God that "of His fullness have we all received, and grace for grace" (*gratiam pro gratia*). In Augustine's exposition, the "first grace" (which is the cause of the second one) means mainly faith. What we are and the good we do we have been given for free, without any merits of our own (*gratia quia gratis datur*). This also holds true for faith (*gratia fidei*), which justifies sinners and grants forgiveness. The justice of faith then brings eternal life, or immortality, not as a reward for one's merits, but as "grace for grace":

*We have received of his fullness, first grace; and again we have received grace, grace for grace (John 1:16). What grace did we receive first? Faith. ... Therefore, if you were worthy of punishment, and there came that one who would not punish sins but would forgive sins, grace was given to you, recompense was not paid. Why is it called grace? Because it is given gratuitously (gratis). For you did not buy with previous merits what you received. ... For if faith is grace, and if eternal life is, as it were, a recompense for faith, God, indeed, seems to pay back eternal life as if it were owed (Owed to whom? To the man of faith because he won it by faith), but because faith itself is grace, and eternal life is a grace for grace.*<sup>162</sup>

<sup>160</sup> P.-M. Hombert even finds here a clear echo of the emerging Pelagian controversy; that is why he dates the redaction of the work (which in its original form dates to 404) to 412 (see P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 110–136).

<sup>161</sup> The link between virginity and humility does not pertain to Augustine only, but it gains exceptional prominence in the context of Augustine's Christology and theology of grace; see P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 142 incl. n. 422.

<sup>162</sup> *Accepimus enim de plenitudine eius, primo gratiam; et rursum accepimus gratiam, gratiam pro gratia. Quam gratiam primo accepimus? Fidem. ... Si ergo supplicio dignus fuisti, et*

The grace of faith is rewarded by the grace of eternal life, i.e., the vision or the knowledge of God.<sup>163</sup> While God gives the first grace (gratuitously) as a merciful father, he gives the second one in accordance with justice as the judge. What he rewards is not human merits, but his own gifts (*dona sua coronat, non merita tua*).<sup>164</sup>

This analysis from Augustine's third sermon on the Gospel of John corresponds to his exposition from the answer to Simplicianus; here, however, grace is not treated with respect to human freedom, but soteriology.<sup>165</sup> Human beings, born from Adam's race, burdened with concupiscence (*concupiscentia*), i.e., the heritage of sin and death (*tradux peccati et mortis*), are not capable of fulfilling the law on their own.<sup>166</sup> They were redeemed by Christ from the situation "under sin" into the state "under grace". The law given through the servant had only a mediating function: indicating the unpropitious human situation, it was not able to overcome it. Grace, brought by the God-Word in person and without mediation, leads directly to the goal:<sup>167</sup> men are set free from their guilt<sup>168</sup> because through the new birth—on the ground of their will and God's grace (*voluntatis et gratiae*)—they are released from their punishment for Adam's burden:

The first man fell; and all who were born of him came bringing from him (*de illo traxerunt*) the concupiscence of the flesh. It was necessary that another man be born who came bringing no concupiscence. A man, and a man; a man for death, and a man for life. ... Why are all in sin? Because no one has been born apart from Adam. But that they be born from Adam pertains to necessity; coming from condemnation to be born through Christ pertains to

---

*venit ille qui non peccata puniret, sed peccata donaret; gratia tibi data est, non merces reddita. Unde vocatur gratia? Quia gratis datur. Non enim praecedentibus meritis emisti quod accepisti. ... Si enim fides gratia est, et vita aeterna quasi merces est fidei, videtur quidem Deus vitam aeternam tamquam debitam reddere (cui debitam? Fideli, quia promeruit illam per fidem); sed quia ipsa fides gratia est, et vita aeterna gratia est pro gratia (In Ioh. 3,8–9: CCL 36, 24f.).* English translation by J.W. Rettig, 82f.

<sup>163</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,20: CCL 36, 29.

<sup>164</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,10: CCL 36, 25.

<sup>165</sup> The Christological aspect of these sermons is discussed by M.-F. Berrouard, *Introduction*, 44–54 and 61–78.

<sup>166</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,12: CCL 36, 25f. Concerning this passage as a testimony of Augustine's doctrine on original sin see V. Grossi, "Il peccato originale nella catechesi di s. Agostino prima della polemica pelagiana", in: *Augustinianum*, 10, 1970, 325–359, 458–492, esp. 355–359. For other passages in *In Ioh.* 3–4, see idem, *La liturgia battesimale in S. Agostino. Studio sulla catechesi del peccato originale negli anni 393–412*, Roma 1993, 39–44.

<sup>167</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,2: CCL 36, 20f.

<sup>168</sup> *Per servum lex data est, reos fecit; per imperatorem indulgentia data est, reos liberavit (In Ioh. 3,16: CCL 36, 27).*

the will and grace. Men are not compelled to be born through Christ. It was not because they willed it that men have been born from Adam; nonetheless all who are from Adam are sinners with sin. All who are through Christ are justified and just, not in themselves but in him. ... Because that man, the head, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not with the transmission of sin (*cum traduce peccati*), though he still came with mortal flesh.<sup>169</sup>

The new human race is established by Christ's coming in the flesh and his humility<sup>170</sup> and suffering for men, also called "grace" (*gratia*).<sup>171</sup>

This new birth, however, is not attained by all men. Humankind is divided into "people born for the wrath of God" (*populus natus ad iram Dei*), fore-known by God (*praecognitus*), and "separated people" (*populus distinctus*), consisting of those who believe and will persevere in their faith. These men, too, God knows (*novit*), although both groups will only be separated during the last judgement.

For there is a certain people, born for the wrath of God and predestined (*praecognitus*) for this. For God knows who will believe and who will not believe; God knows who will persevere in that which they have believed and who will lapse, and all who are to be for eternal life have been numbered by God. And he already knows that separated people (*populum distinctum*). ... Therefore he [John] observed a division in the Spirit, but a mingling in the human race; and what was not yet separated in place, he separated in understanding, he separated in the sight of his heart. And he saw two multitudes, the believers and the unbelievers.<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> *Cecidit primus homo; et omnes qui de illo nati sunt, de illo traxerunt concupiscentiam carnis. Oportebat ut nasceretur alius homo qui nullam traxit concupiscentiam. Homo, et homo: homo ad mortem, et homo ad vitam. ... Quare omnes in peccato? Quia nemo natus est praeter Adam. Ut autem nascerentur ex Adam, necessitatis fuit ex damnatione; nasci per Christum, voluntatis est et gratiae. Non coguntur homines nasci per Christum. Non quia voluerunt, nati sunt ex Adam. Omnes tamen qui ex Adam, cum peccato peccatores; omnes qui per Christum, iustificati et iusti, non in se, sed in illo. ... Quia ille caput Dominus noster Iesus Christus, non cum traduce peccati venit, sed tamen venit cum carne mortali (In Ioh. 3,12: CCL 36, 26).* English translation by J.W. Rettig, 85.

<sup>170</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,15: CCL 36, 27. The theme of humility in the first of Augustine's sermons on the Gospel of John is accentuated by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 149–152.

<sup>171</sup> See *In Ioh.* 3,14: CCL 36, 27.

<sup>172</sup> *Est enim quidam populus natus ad iram Dei, et ad hoc praecognitus. Qui sint enim credituri, et qui non sint credituri, novit Deus; qui sint perseveraturi in eo quod crediderunt, et qui sint lapsuri, novit Deus, et numerati sunt Deo omnes futuri in vitam aeternam; et novit iam illum populum distinctum. ... Adtendit ergo [Iohannes] in spiritu divisionem, in genere autem humano commixtionem; et quod nondum locis separatum est, separavit intellectu, separavit cordis adspectu; et vidit duos populos, fidelium et infidelium (In Ioh. 14,8: CCL 36, 146 f.).* English translation by J.W. Rettig, 71 f.

The distinction does not just consist in the fact that Christ allows only some to know him by being “born of water and the Spirit” (John 3:5) (he “trusts himself to them”; *se credere*).<sup>173</sup> In the church, too, both groups share the same space, in the same way that Esau and Jacob shared their mother’s womb, and the division between them will be made at the end of days (*in fine discernantur*).<sup>174</sup> Only God’s grace makes it possible to anticipate that one day all will be separated that is now intermingled.<sup>175</sup> Yet this knowledge is not attained by all men: “But if you do not yet understand that he is God [who will separate both groups in the eschatological future], you have not yet received his testimony.”<sup>176</sup>

\*\*\*

Neither in the ongoing anti-Manichaean polemic nor in the majority of the exegetical and ascetic works from the beginning of his episcopate does Augustine explicitly return to the problem of grace and freedom as laid out in the answer to Simplicianus and depicted in the *Confessions* (in some of his works we even find traces of his previous teaching). Nevertheless, in *Adnotationes in Iob* (dated to 399) Augustine speaks out in defence of grace against its “enemies”, and in this work and several others (*De sancta virginitate*, *De Genesi ad litteram* and *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*) he goes on to elaborate the two most conspicuous consequences of his doctrine from the answer to Simplicianus, namely the notions of original sin, afflicting the whole human race as attributable guilt, and God’s predestination of the chosen ones before the creation of the world, independently of their future will. In none of these works, however, are these two themes elaborated on with such consistency and expressed with such sharpness as in the answer to Simplicianus.

In the reflections on original sin, Augustine (besides its character of attributable guilt<sup>177</sup>) gradually develops another of its aspects, namely its relationship to “libidinous” human procreation. This is a sin common to

<sup>173</sup> See *In Ioh.* 11,3: CCL 36, 111.

<sup>174</sup> See *In Ioh.* 11,10: CCL 36, 116.

<sup>175</sup> See *In Ioh.* 14,8: CCL 36, 146 f.

<sup>176</sup> *Sed si nondum illum intellegis Deum, nondum accepisti testimonium eius* (*In Ioh.* 14,8: CCL 36, 147). English translation after J.W. Rettig, 73. This paradoxical conclusion as genuine *intellectus gratiae* is highly appreciated by J. Lössl (*Intellectus*, 172–174).

<sup>177</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 4,11: SC 75, 240, where Augustine makes it clear that corporeal birth brings with it sin (*trahit secum peccatum*), i.e., concupiscence, which brings about condemnation before it can become the cause of personal misdemeanours (that is the reason why infants are baptised).



all people, with the exception of Christ, born from a virgin. In Augustine's opinion, original sin implies the paralysis of the will and thus predisposes men to personal failure. The manifestation and, subsequently, the medium of the transfer of the hereditary burden is the "libidinous" procreation of men, which, ultimately, is beyond the control of the will. This last theme, missing in the answer to Simplicianus, will go on to gain prominence in Augustine's dispute with the Pelagians.

As far as the question of God's predestination is concerned, it is not quite clear in all passages whether Augustine refers to predestination in eternity in the sense of preceding God's *knowledge*, or preceding God's *determination* of the human will, or rather, whether he is well aware of the fact that both of them must actually be one in his conception. He often seems to be working with the former option in the way we know it from the period of his presbyterate.

As for the images and theological themes by means of which Augustine expresses the impact of grace, these have already appeared in his older works: the inclusion of Christians into the body of Christ, the freely given participation in Christ's sonship in relation to God, the participation in Christ as light, and the gift of the Spirit-love meaning a voluntary turning towards God and cleaving to him.

A truly remarkable aspect of Augustine's doctrine of grace is, in my opinion, his emphasis on the freely given nature of relationships grounded in grace as a feature typical of Christianity as a religion of grace. Augustine's God (as opposed to the God of the Manichaeans) creates from abundance, not under constraint, having no other motive than his own will. None of the things created could have contributed to their creation, which in itself is a pure gift. Similarly, God will save a stray man irrespective of his merits (or despite them); this, too, is a work of pure grace given *gratis*, or a work of love. The adequate reaction of men can only consist in reverence shown *gratis*, i.e., gratefulness or love, which has no other goal than God himself (it does not aim at the achievement of wordly goods, as is the case, according to Augustine, in Judaism and paganism). This attitude, Augustine argues, manifests itself not only in relation to God: what men were given freely they also give freely to others because the others (irrespective of their merits), too, are the addressees of God's grace and love.

I believe that the theme of love given *gratis* elaborated especially in Augustine's sermons on the biblical book of Psalms (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*) and the First Epistle of John (*In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus decem*), might have provided firmer ground for the doctrine of grace than

the reflections on the fact that human nature is spoiled and the necessary impact of God on the will. Unfortunately, the clash with the Donatists and, later, with the Pelagians, turned Augustine's attention elsewhere.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> P.-M. Hombert takes a different view, regarding the Pelagian dispute as an opportune moment which enabled Augustine to elaborate on his doctrine of grace, which he had arrived at before and partially captured in his sermons from 395 to 411 (see P.-M. Hombert, "Augustin", 244f.).



## CHAPTER FOUR

### ANTI-DONATIST WORKS

The polemic against the Donatists, in which Augustine participated passionately, made a considerable mark on the first fifteen years of his episcopate. This church structure, the outcome of the dissension in 312 (the opposing Donatist synod of Carthage),<sup>1</sup> was at least as strong in Africa as Augustine's church, if not stronger.<sup>2</sup> Both groups claimed the title "Catholic" (*catholica*) Church: the Donatists with respect to the "fullness of sacraments" they believed they had, Augustine's church with respect to its spread among all nations, which made it different from the Donatists, who were settled only in Africa.<sup>3</sup> (From now on, this term will be used together with Augustine for his church, although in contemporary literature it is also referred to as the "Caecilians".<sup>4</sup>)

---

<sup>1</sup> The traditional date of the beginning of the schism in 311/312 is sometimes moved to as early as 305 (an overview of the research is given by A. Schindler, "Die Theologie der Donatisten und Augustins Reaktion", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius, eds., *Internationales Symposium*, 142 f.).

<sup>2</sup> For the historical circumstances of the Donatist schism, see W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church. A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1952; A. Schindler, s. v. "Afrika", I, in: *TRE* 1 (1977), 654–668; the sources were collected by J.-L. Maier, *Le dossier du donatisme*, I–II, Berlin 1987–1989. The traditional image of the Donatist church as a rebellious minority was gradually replaced by an image of this church as a major one, especially in the Numidian country (for more details, see W.H.C. Frend, "Donatus *paene totam Africam decepit*. How?", in: *JEH* 48, 1997, 611–627; J.J. O'Donnell, *Augustine*, 211). On Donatist theology, see Y. Congar, "Introduction générale", in: *BA* 28, Paris 1963, 7–133; W. Simonis, *Ecclesia visibilis et invisibilis. Untersuchungen zur Ekklesiologie und Sakramentenlehre in der afrikanischen Tradition von Cyprian bis Augustinus*, Frankfurt a. M. 1970; A. Schindler, "L'histoire du donatisme considérée du point de vue de sa propre théologie", in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1982, 1306–1315; for the grounds of the schism and (inconsistent) Donatist ecclesiology turning against the "traitors", see B. Kriegbaum, *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Martyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus*, Innsbruck—Wien 1986. An overview of the research is given by A. Schindler, "Die Theologie".

<sup>3</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 2,2: *BA* 28, 504; *Brev. coll. Don.* III,3,3: *BA* 32, 134. For Augustine, "catholicity" (its wide spread among all nations) almost serves as evidence of the authenticity of his church; see e.g. *Contra ep. Parm.* 1,2,2: *BA* 28, 212–214; *Ep. cath.* 7,17–18: *BA* 28, 548; *Ep. cath.* 12,32: *BA* 28, 594.

<sup>4</sup> See J.J. O'Donnell, *Augustine*, 209–243.

The Donatists reproved their adversaries for their failure as bishops during Diocletian's persecution (303–305), as they had saved themselves by handing over the holy Scriptures to their enemies. In their opinion, these traitors (*traditores*) polluted the whole congregation by their unforgivable failure (the reproach aimed directly at Caecilian, the bishop of Carthage, who, according to the Donatists, was “infected” by the sin of his consecrator, Felix of Aptunga), and the contamination continued to spread (in Augustine's time, it had already lasted for one hundred years). The leader of the African revolt between 313 and 355 was Donatus, the opposing bishop of Carthage, who was then succeeded by Parmenian (355–391/2).<sup>5</sup>

In the eyes of the Donatists, Augustine's church was a kind of “corrupted mass”,<sup>6</sup> administering contaminated sacraments. The Christians who come from them to the Donatists must be baptised again, for baptism administered by an unworthy minister (i.e., a minister sharing sacraments with a traitor) is not valid. In this point, which became the main target of Augustine's polemic, the legacy of Cyprian, the African saint, bishop and martyr, known for rebaptising heretics, was invoked by the Donatists (legitimately to some extent), who regarded themselves as his heirs.<sup>7</sup>

The Roman Empire had been engaging in this dispute since Constantine's time (in part to protect the Catholic Church,<sup>8</sup> and in part to ensure the tolerance of both churches), and both sides turned to it. At the time

---

<sup>5</sup> The early phase of the Donatist opposition was depicted from the point of view of the Catholic bishop Optatus of Milevis in his work *Libri septem (de schismate Donatistarum)* (CSEL 26), from which Augustine drew as well.

<sup>6</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,22,42: BA 28, 380.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. *De bapt.* I,18,28: BA 29, 116; *De bapt.* II,1,1: BA 29, 124. Although Augustine criticises Cyprian's position (expressed in his letter to Jubaianus, *Ep.* 73: CCL 3C, 529–562; for more details, see G. Bavaud, “Introduction”, in: BA 29, Paris 1964, 32 ff.) as erroneous, he turns to his authority to show that the bond of unity is not to be broken even if one must put up with dissenting or openly evil members of the church (see *De bapt.* II,15,20: BA 29, 172–174; *De bapt.* IV,12,18: BA 29, 276–278; *Contra Cresc.* II,34,43: BA 31, 250–252; *Contra Cresc.* III,1–2,2: BA 31, 266–268). Cyprian's position, however, was presumably closer to that of the Donatists (for more details, see J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 106 n. 28; R.A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*, Cambridge 1970, 105–132).

<sup>8</sup> In their resistance to the Catholic Church, the Donatists relied on the dislike of the Numidian country people of the Roman Empire and its administration, army and taxation. The dislike was manifested by armed plundering groups of the native people, *circumcellioni*, who willingly supported the Donatist anti-Roman opposition, frequently giving it a violent form. Yet it would probably be an exaggeration to regard Donatism only as an ideological cover for the social or culturally ethnic anti-Roman resistance among the African people (for more details, see A. Schindler, *Die Theologie*, 140f.). On the role of the Donatist schism in Augustine's doctrine of the relationship of the church and the state, see H.A. Deane, *The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine*, New York—London 1963, 174–211.

when the Donatists were at their strongest (392–395), the emperor Theodosius issued several edicts in support of the Catholic side, and in 399, the emperor Honorius recommended in a special decree that the Donatists, regarded until then as “schismatics” (the originators of the dissension), should be proceeded against as “heretics” (propagators of fallacious teachings). This decision was supported by his anti-Donatist decree in 405,<sup>9</sup> and finally, during the trial at Carthage in 411 and in the subsequent imperial edict (412), the whole dispute was adjudicated to be a victory for the Catholics.<sup>10</sup>

Augustine is often accused of being the leading “ideologist” of the repressive measures of the state against the Donatists, in the justification of which, as some scholars argue, he was aided by his doctrine of grace.<sup>11</sup> However, according to other scholars, it is not quite clear whether Augustine’s answer to Simplicianus contributed to the elaboration of his anti-Donatist theology, or whether, on the contrary, the conflict with the Donatists brought about the radicalisation of his doctrine of grace.<sup>12</sup>

Augustine pursued the polemic with the Donatists in several monographs (between 394 and 421), and substantial echoes of it can also be found in his preaching activity and his correspondence. Augustine’s main anti-Donatist works fall into the first period of his episcopate (before the outbreak of the Pelagian controversy in 411): *Contra epistulam Parmeniani*

---

<sup>9</sup> It is this edict, not the later anti-Donatist laws, which is echoed in Augustine’s anti-Donatist works and also in his *In Ioh.* 6; *Ep.* 93 and *Serm.* 47. See A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 22 ff.

<sup>10</sup> The measures taken by the state until 412 consisted of the confiscation of Donatist property, bans on church services and the exiling of the bishops; military actions to pacify communal riots were quite exceptional. The fate of the Donatists after the 412 edict is not very clear: in part they were probably suppressed, while some of their churches (particularly in the Numidian country) lasted until the Islamification of northern Africa (they presumably existed as late as the 6th century). After the Vandal invasion in 429, however, the whole schism seems to have lost its importance in comparison with the Arian persecution of both parties.

<sup>11</sup> According to K. Flasch, Augustine “turned towards consent to violence” in his answer to Simplicianus (i.e., to the use of violence as an educational device), as his attitude to the Donatists shows (see K. Flasch, *Logik*, 318 and 116–120).

<sup>12</sup> J.P. Burns argues that it was only the clash with the Donatists (not just the expositions of Paul’s theology) that became the “matrix” of Augustine’s doctrine of grace in the way he elaborated on it in the polemic against the Pelagians (see J.P. Burns, *The Development*, 86–88). As for the relationship of the will and violence, J.P. Burns again seeks to show a connection contrary to the one proposed by K. Flasch: Augustine’s vindication of violence brought about a change in his conception of freedom and made it possible for him to enunciate the doctrine of the prevalence of grace (see J.P. Burns, *The Development*, 75 ff.).

(three books), *De baptismo* (seven books), *Contra litteras Petiliani* (three books), *Epistula ad catholicos* (= *De unitate Ecclesiae*), *Contra Cresconium grammaticum* (four books), *Liber de unico baptismo*, and a record of the proceedings against the Donatists in Carthage in 411 called *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*. With respect to our subject, only such themes will be dealt with here as represent a possible application of Augustine's doctrine of grace or a prerequisite of its further development.

#### 4.1. *The Sacrament of Grace and Grace Itself*

A conspicuous feature of Augustine's anti-Donatist argumentation consists in his repeated highlighting of the fact that the efficacy of baptism is guaranteed by Christ alone, which explains why it is not linked with the personal holiness or moral integrity of the minister.<sup>13</sup> Deriving the efficacy of baptism from any personal qualities would mean relying on man in the matter of salvation, not on God,<sup>14</sup> and on human morals instead of grace (*gratia*).<sup>15</sup> Baptism is not administered on the ground of the merits (*ex merito*) of the minister, but on the ground of Christ's merit.<sup>16</sup> It is Christ, not the minister, who gives grace and justifies the sinner:

For behold in our case, who assert with the eloquence of truth that the man who believes is not justified by him by whom he is baptized, but by Him of whom it is written: *To him that believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness* (Rom. 4:5), since we do not glory in men, and strive, when we glory, to glory in the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 3:21; 1:31) ...<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup> According to Augustine, Christ himself baptises with power (*potestate*), while his disciples do so only in the capacity of a servant (*ministerio*); see *In Ioh.* 5,6: CCL 36, 43 (similarly *In Ioh.* 15,3: CCL 36, 151). In another passage, Augustine makes it clear that Christ himself is an eternal priest, which is why the Christian sacrifice cannot be thwarted by an unworthy bishop (see *Contra ep. Parm.* II,5,10: BA 28, 290). The bishop is in fact not a mediator between God and men in the same sense as Christ, who makes the sacrifice in himself (see *Contra ep. Parm.* II,8,15: BA 28, 302). As it turns out in the polemic, even the Donatists had no doubt that Christ himself becomes "the beginning, root and head" (*origo, radix, caput*) of the baptised person; what they emphasised was in which society this takes place "in a better way" (see *Contra Cresc.* III,7,7: BA 31, 280). Augustine's answer (from his point of view) runs along the lines that although a good minister may mediate the participation in Christ in a better way, even a bad one can still do so (*Contra Cresc.* IV,20,23–24: BA 31, 516–520).

<sup>14</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* III,28,33: BA 30, 650–652.

<sup>15</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,10,22: BA 28, 324.

<sup>16</sup> See *De bapt.* III,4,6: BA 29, 188; similarly *De bapt.* IV,4,5: BA 29, 242.

<sup>17</sup> *Ecce enim nos, qui cum veritatis eloquio dicimus non iustificari credentem ab homine a quo baptizatur, sed ab illo de quo scriptum est: Credenti in eum qui iustificat impium, deputatur*

Wherefore, whether a man receives the sacrament of baptism from a faithful or a faithless minister, his whole hope is in Christ, that he fall not under the condemnation, that *Cursed is he that placeth his hope in man!* (Jer. 17:5)<sup>18</sup>

It is not the perfection of men (unattainable in this life), but the grace of God, that brings purification;<sup>19</sup> the minister does not give what is his, but what belongs to God.<sup>20</sup> If a perfidious minister did not mediate salvation, but spread guilt (*reatus*) instead, no man could be sure as to what they actually accepted. Not only would salvation be uncertain, but there would be none at all.<sup>21</sup>

In Augustine's opinion, even an unworthy minister can thus administer a valid baptism: not only a minister of dubious personal qualities (e.g. Judas,<sup>22</sup> a murderer,<sup>23</sup> or a reprobated sinner<sup>24</sup>), but also a minister belonging to a schismatic or heretical group<sup>25</sup> (Augustine refers to the Donatists as schismatics at first, and later as heretics, perceiving a gradual transition between the two<sup>26</sup>).

---

*fides ad iustitiam; quoniam non gloriamur in homine nitimurque donante ipso, cum gloriamur, in domino gloriari* (*Contra litt. Petil.* III,36,42: BA 30, 672–674). English translation by J.R. King, 614. Similarly *Contra litt. Petil.* I,5,6: BA 30, 144.

<sup>18</sup> *Quapropter sive a fidei sive a perfido dispensatore sacramentum baptismi quisque percipiat, spes ei omnis in Christo sit, ne sit maledictus omnis qui spem suam ponit in homine* (*Contra litt. Petil.* III,42,51: BA 30, 690). English translation by J.R. King, 617.

<sup>19</sup> *Mundati enim sumus eundem per gratiam Dei. Sed ne tunc quidem mundabimus aliquem, cum fuerit perfecta nostra mundatio ... Sicut autem spe salvi facti sumus, ita spe mundati sumus in perfecta salute et in perfecta munditia. Quomodo ergo sanare et mundare iam possumus, qui nec tunc poterimus, cum omni modo mundi salvi que fuerimus?* (*Contra ep. Parm.* II,14,32: BA 28, 354).

<sup>20</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* II,30,69: BA 30, 310–312.

<sup>21</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* I,2,3–3,4: BA 30, 138–140. Here Augustine challenges the distinction between open sin (denial of faith) and concealed sin, with only the former being contagious in the view of the Donatists (see also *Brev. coll. Don.* III,8,14: BA 32, 162–164).

<sup>22</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 21,58: BA 28, 668.

<sup>23</sup> See *De bapt.* V,20,28: BA 29, 376.

<sup>24</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,13,31: BA 28, 350.

<sup>25</sup> See *De bapt.* I,1,2: BA 29, 58; *De bapt.* III,11,16: BA 29, 196–198.

<sup>26</sup> Augustine corrects the definitions presented by the Donatist grammarian Cresconius, who maintains that a heresy is a group based on a doctrinal deviation (*haeresis est diversa sequentium secta*), while a schism is a separation of groups which keep following the same doctrine (*schisma vero eadem sequentium separatio*) (*Contra Cresc.* II,4,6: BA 31, 162), thus regarding what is going on between the Catholics and Donatists as a mere schism (*Contra Cresc.* II,3,4: BA 31, 156). Augustine is convinced that a schism is always brought on by a deviation (in the case of the Donatists it is the view of baptism), perceiving the only distinction between the two terms in the duration of the split they engender: while a schism is “a recent split of a communion over some doctrinal deviation” (*recens congregationis ex aliqua sententiarum diversitate dissensio*), a heresy is “a schism of an older date” (*schisma inveteratum*) (*Contra Cresc.* II,7,9: BA 31, 168).



Against the Donatist practice of rebaptising the Catholics Augustine objects that the sacrament of baptism cannot be repeated<sup>27</sup> because it gives each man a permanent sign, similar to the sign of a soldier (*regale signum, nota militaris, character imperatoris, titulus imperatoris*), which cannot be lost even by desertion, although it is naturally possible to bear it in an unworthy way (outside the military) which harms oneself.<sup>28</sup> That is why the Catholics do not rebaptise former Donatists, regarding them as validly baptised: baptism is always Christ's baptism, not a Donatist baptism.<sup>29</sup> The Donatists administer it in a valid, albeit unlawfully transmitted (*inlicite*) way,<sup>30</sup> and only by their conversion to the Catholic Church does what until then they only "had",<sup>31</sup> or rather, what they had to their harm and destruction (*perniciose*), begin to "be of use" (*utiliter habere*).<sup>32</sup> Where love, given by the Holy Spirit, is missing, baptism is of no use<sup>33</sup> (for without love, no gifts can be of any profit; see 1 Cor. 13:1–4), and love is obviously missing where unity

<sup>27</sup> Augustine rejects the Donatist New Testament evidence of rebaptising (see Acts 19:1–5), arguing that the baptism of John the Baptist was not a Christian baptism yet, which is why it had to be repeated from the hands of the apostles (*Contra litt. Petil.* II,37,85–87; *BA* 30, 338–344; *De unico bapt.* 7,9; *BA* 31, 680–682; on John's baptism, see also *In Ioh.* 5,5–6; *CCL* 36, 43). Moreover, Augustine reverses the whole argument in order to show that the personal holiness of the minister is not crucial for the validity of a baptism, for it was indisputable with John, and yet it did not suffice to render the baptism valid (see *De bapt.* V,11,13; *BA* 29, 346–348).

<sup>28</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,13,29; *BA* 28, 344; *De bapt.* I,4,5; *BA* 29, 68; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,108,247; *BA* 30, 560; *In Ioh.* 6,15; *CCL* 36, 61; *In Ep. Ioh.* 5,6; *SC* 75, 258; *In Ep. Ioh.* 7,11; *SC* 75, 334; *Enarr. Psalm.* 39,1; *CCL* 38, 424.

<sup>29</sup> See *De bapt.* III,11,16; *BA* 29, 196–198; similarly *De bapt.* III,19,25; *BA* 29, 220; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,49,59; *BA* 30, 708; *De unico bapt.* 2,3; *BA* 31, 666. As far as ordination is concerned, Augustine maintains that it is also unrepeatable (see *Contra ep. Parm.* II,13,28; *BA* 28, 340), regarding it as valid in the case of the Donatists as well (see *De bapt.* I,1,2; *BA* 29, 58).

<sup>30</sup> See *De bapt.* VI,15,25; *BA* 29, 438.

<sup>31</sup> See *De bapt.* IV,17,24; *BA* 29, 294; *De bapt.* VII,41,81; *BA* 29, 548–550; similarly *De bapt.* I,12,18; *BA* 29, 98.

<sup>32</sup> Augustine makes a distinction between "not having" baptism, "having baptism unto salvation" (*salubriter*) and "having baptism unto destruction" (*perniciose*) (see *Contra ep. Parm.* II,13,28; *BA* 28, 342; similarly *Contra Cresc.* II,16,20; *BA* 31, 194). In another passage he says that it is possible to have sacraments "unto salvation" or "unto judgment" (*Contra litt. Petil.* III,40,46; *BA* 30, 682). In this respect he makes it clear that although baptism is good in itself, its abuse may bring on destruction, just like the Jewish law (see *De bapt.* V,8,9; *BA* 29, 338; *Contra Cresc.* I,24,29; *BA* 31, 126; *De unico bapt.* 3,4; *BA* 31, 668) or the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ (see *Contra Cresc.* I,25,30; *BA* 31, 128–130).

<sup>33</sup> The biblical prototype of a validly baptised man, who nevertheless lacks love (the Holy Spirit), and who thus actually has baptism to destruction, is Simon the Sorcerer (Acts 8:9–24); see *De bapt.* I,10,14; *BA* 29, 88; *De bapt.* IV,21,28; *BA* 29, 304–306.

has been broken.<sup>34</sup> The sins of others, Augustine holds, are not a legitimate reason for a schism; on the contrary, a schism itself is a wrongdoing.<sup>35</sup> The Donatists are therefore like “antichrists” who “went out from us, but they were not of us” (1 John 2:19).<sup>36</sup>

Augustine thus makes a distinction between a valid baptism on the one hand, which he also calls the “sacrament of grace” (*sacramentum gratiae*), and its spiritual use or “grace” (*gratia*) itself, i.e., forgiveness of sins, on the other.<sup>37</sup> A valid baptism can be administered even in a schismatic or heretical group (just as the true God can be worshipped outside the church<sup>38</sup>), but it is not accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit and the forgiveness of sins, because this gift of love is present only in the church’s unity (i.e., in the Catholic Church).<sup>39</sup> Here Augustine applies his notion of the “whole Christ” as the “head” and the “members” joined in one body: participating in Christ necessarily means participating in his body, in which the Holy Spirit is “poured out”.<sup>40</sup> Baptism always belongs to the body, even if it is also administered outside it.<sup>41</sup>

Whether a valid baptism is useful depends on the personal conversion of the baptised,<sup>42</sup> which, with baptised children—in the case of their death—can be “supplied” by grace (by the same token, an unintentionally missing baptism may be “filled up” by God in the case of the conversion of the heart):

---

<sup>34</sup> See *De bapt.* I,9,12: BA 29, 84–86; *De bapt.* III,16,21: BA 29, 210–212; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,55,126: BA 30, 390; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,77,172: BA 30, 428–430; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,99,228: BA 30, 524; *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,2–3: SC 75, 412–416. As J.P. Burns points out, it is love (the bond of unity), and not only faith, which Augustine comes to regard as the distinctive feature of the authentic church (see J.P. Burns, *The Development*, 64 ff.).

<sup>35</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,9,19: BA 28, 310–312; *Ep. cath.* 2,3: BA 28, 510; *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,10: SC 75, 436.

<sup>36</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 3,7: SC 75, 196–198.

<sup>37</sup> See *De bapt.* V,21,29: BA 29, 380; VII,19,37: BA 29, 528–530; similarly *De bapt.* IV,14,21: BA 29, 284, where Augustine notices that “the grace of baptism” (*gratia baptismatis*) is not the baptism itself, but salvation (*salus*), which is given by means of baptism to those who accept it properly.

<sup>38</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* I,29,34: BA 31, 136–138; *De unico bapt.* 5,8: BA 31, 678.

<sup>39</sup> See *De bapt.* III,13,18: BA 29, 200–202; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,32,74: BA 30, 320; *Ep. cath.* 23,67: BA 28, 686; *Contra Cresc.* IV,5,6: BA 31, 478–480. That is why Augustine says that not even a virtuous heretic will enter the kingdom of God (*De bapt.* IV,18,25: BA 29, 296–298), because he excluded himself from the community of love (*De bapt.* IV,20,27: BA 29, 302).

<sup>40</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* II,12,15–13,16: BA 31, 184–186; *Ep. cath.* 4,7: BA 28, 518–520.

<sup>41</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 24,68: BA 28, 688; *Contra Cresc.* II,10,12: BA 31, 174–176.

<sup>42</sup> See *De bapt.* VII,6,11: BA 29, 514.

... [S]o in infants who die baptized, we must believe that the same grace of the Almighty supplies the want, that, not from perversity of will, but from insufficiency of age, they can neither believe with the heart unto righteousness, nor make confession with the mouth unto salvation (cf. Rom. 10:10). ... By all these considerations it is proved that the sacrament of baptism is one thing, the conversion of the heart another; but that man's salvation is made complete through the two together. Nor are we to suppose that, if one of these be wanting, it necessarily follows that the other is wanting also; because the sacrament may exist in the infant without the conversion of the heart; and this was found to be possible without the sacrament in the case of the thief (cf. Luke 23:40–43), God in either case filling up what was involuntarily wanting. But when either of these requisites is wanting intentionally, then the man is responsible for the omission. And baptism may exist when the conversion of the heart is wanting; but, with respect to such conversion, it may indeed be found when baptism has not been received, but never when it has been despised. Nor can there be said in any way to be a turning of the heart to God when the sacrament of God is treated with contempt.<sup>43</sup>

However, in Augustine's opinion, whether a valid baptism is useful depends also on the quality of the church community which the baptised person enters and which must not be burdened with guilt for a schism. Against the Donatist fear of "contamination" (*contagio*, *contaminatio*) with the sins of others, caused by participating in the same sacraments as the former apostates,<sup>44</sup> Augustine puts his notion of schismatic sacraments as valid, albeit useless if not harmful as a result of the guilt stemming from participation in the sin of disunity.<sup>45</sup> Regarding it as impossible to "become infected" with

<sup>43</sup> ... *sic in infantibus qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia omnipotentis implere credenda est, quod non ex impia voluntate, sed ex aetatis indigentia nec corde credere ad iustitiam possunt nec ore confiteri ad salutem. ... Quibus omnibus rebus ostenditur aliud esse sacramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis, sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri. Nec, si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse ut et alterum desit, quia et illud sine isto potest esse in infante et hoc sine illo potuit esse in latrone, complente Deo sive in illo sive in isto quod non ex voluntate defuisset, cum vero ex voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi. Et baptismus quidem potest inesse ubi conversio cordis defuerit, conversio autem cordis potest quidem inesse non percepto baptismo, sed contempto baptismo non potest. Neque enim ullo modo dicenda est conversio cordis ad Deum, cum Dei sacramentum contemnitur* (*De bapt.* IV,24,31–25,32: BA 29, 314–316). English translation by J.R. King, 462.

<sup>44</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,4,8: BA 28, 286; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,39,94: BA 30, 356; *Contra Cresc.* III,81,93: BA 31, 458; *De unico bapt.* 14,24: BA 31, 716–718.

<sup>45</sup> See above, chap. II.4.1, n. 32. Augustine says explicitly that although baptism outside the (Catholic) Church is valid, it does not serve for salvation, but for destruction (see e.g. *De unico bapt.* 6,8: BA 31, 680). Only by conversion to the Catholic Church will a heretic be purified by the "love of unity" (*De unico bapt.* 15,26: BA 31, 724).

the sins of others in any other way than voluntary consent,<sup>46</sup> Augustine presumably considers participation in the sin of schism to be a voluntary act of each member of the splintered community. The difference between the two positions thus seems to lie predominantly in the question of whether the validity of a baptism can be separated from its utility; furthermore, in the opinion concerning which sin burdens a community as a whole to such an extent that it cancels the validity or utility of baptism (whether a denial of faith during persecution, or schism); and finally, in the notion concerning how a member of a given community participates in this sin (whether by participating in the same sacraments, or by one's own consent).

#### 4.2. *The Catholic Church and the "Columba"*

There is another interesting ecclesiological distinction which Augustine's position includes. Baptism, if administered according to Christ's provision, always belongs to the Catholic Church, even where there is no unity with this church and where baptism thus remains useless. On the other hand, even a baptism administered within this community need not be fruitful in itself if not accepted properly and practised in one's life.<sup>47</sup> A man persisting in sin, whether a Catholic or a Donatist, has not accepted baptism to his salvation, but to destruction, and as such does not belong to the church of Christ.<sup>48</sup> The visible community of the Catholic Church is thus latently divided into seeming Christians (for the time being, not yet manifest "antichrists"<sup>49</sup>) and true Christians, belonging to Christ's "Columba", the "only dove" (cf. Song 6:8[9])<sup>50</sup> and "a garden enclosed" (Song 4:12), i.e.,

---

<sup>46</sup> *Qui enim se ipsum castum servat, non communicat peccatis alienis. Si enim communicat consentit, si consentit corrumpitur, si corrumpitur castum se ipsum non servat* (Contra ep. Parm. II,21,40: BA 28, 376). *Neque enim boni communicant peccatis alienis, quibus utique faciendis non consentiunt* (Contra Cresc. IV,26,33: BA 31, 534). ... *nec peccatis communicaret alienis nec cuiusquam immunditiae contrectatione macularetur nec pollueretur tangendo pollutum nec cuiusquam fermento corrumperetur. Haec enim fiunt consensione peccatorum* (De unico bapt. 15,25: BA 31, 720).

<sup>47</sup> See *De bapt.* VI,32,62: BA 29, 474.

<sup>48</sup> See *De bapt.* V,28,39: BA 29, 400.

<sup>49</sup> See *In Ep. Ioh.* 3,9: SC 75, 202.

<sup>50</sup> See *In Ioh.* 6,12: CCL 36, 59; *De bapt.* I,11,15: BA 29, 92. The expression "dove" (*columba*) is employed by Augustine to refer to the true church consisting of the righteous (see e.g. *De bapt.* VI,3,5: BA 29, 410; *Contra Cresc.* II,15,18: BA 31, 188–190). In his sermon on John 1:33, Augustine relates this "body of the dove" to the appearance of a dove at the baptism of Jesus, which tells John the Baptist that Christ alone (not the disciples) baptises with the Holy Spirit

to the church “without spot or wrinkle” (Eph. 5:27)<sup>51</sup> as the fixed number of the chosen ones, which only God knows.<sup>52</sup> Until the end of time, people will not be able to distinguish who is “within” and who “without”, for “many who seem to be without are in reality within, and many who seem to be within yet really are without”.<sup>53</sup> In this famous formulation, Augustine refers to two things: first, belonging to the Catholic Church in itself does not mean belonging to the “Columba”; second, he also expresses the conviction that many a man (e.g. a thief on the cross in Luke 23:40–43) belongs to the “Columba” as a result of the conversion of his heart, but was not allowed by circumstance to enter the visible Catholic community by means of baptism, although he would have done so had he been able to.<sup>54</sup>

In this world, the Catholic Church is thus a “mixed society”, where, apart from the members of the “Columba”, unworthy members also belong<sup>55</sup> (just as in Noah’s Ark there was not only a dove, but also a raven<sup>56</sup>). This mixture

---

(see *In Ioh.* 5,11: CCL 36, 46). The dove (a bird which, according to the traditional notion, has no bile) is at the same time a symbol of love (see *In Ep. Ioh.* 7,11: SC 75, 334). The theme of a “dove”, which goes through the whole of Augustine’s anti-Donatist work and his sermons from that period, is traced by A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 29–33.

<sup>51</sup> On Augustine’s gradually changing interpretation of this line, see A. Zumkeller, “Eph. 5,27 im Verständnis Augustins und seiner donatistischen und pelagianischen Gegner”, in: *Augustinianum*, 16, 1976, 457–474.

<sup>52</sup> See *De bapt.* IV,3,4: BA 29, 238–240; *De bapt.* V,27,38: BA 29, 394–396. These biblical images, which were already employed by Cyprian, were also very popular among the Donatists; see W.H.C. Frend, “Donatus”, 625. For that matter, Augustine was quite indebted to the Donatist Tyconius for the notion of the church as a “twofold body” (*Regulae*, 3), however much Augustine modified it (for more details, see J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon. A Study into Augustine’s City of God and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden 1991, 254–274).

<sup>53</sup> ... *multi qui foris videntur intus sunt et multi qui intus videntur foris sunt* (*De bapt.* V,27,38: BA 29, 396). English translation by J.R. King, 477. The traditional African ecclesiology, the heirs of which the Donatists claimed to be (to a large extent rightly, in fact) and which drew a sharp line between being “without” and “within” the true church as the society of the holy ones, is thus transformed by Augustine into the notion of two eschatological communions, the members of which are intermingled in history (*saeculum*); for more details, see R.A. Markus, *Saeculum*, 105–132.

<sup>54</sup> See *De bapt.* IV,22,29: BA 29, 308–310. People who remain intentionally outside the Catholic communion are thus not members of the “Columba” (see *Contra Cresc.* II,21,26: BA 31, 212).

<sup>55</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 14,35: BA 28, 602–604; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,3,4: BA 30, 590; *De unico bapt.* 14,24: BA 31, 718; *Brev. coll. Don.* III,9,16: BA 32, 168. Against the Donatist criticism that in this conception the present church and the eschatological church are in fact two different societies, with only the latter being “holy”, Augustine argues that it is the same holy church in two forms: it will be one way (*aliter*) in the eschatological future and it is another way (*aliter*) now when the evil ones are intermingled in it (*Brev. coll. Don.* III,10,19–20: BA 32, 176–178).

<sup>56</sup> See *In Ioh.* 6,2: CCL 36, 54.

of the “good” and “bad” ones will be infallibly divided by God during the Day of Judgement; however, it is not the task of men to separate it because they would only cause harm. Weeds and wheat have to grow together until the harvest if they are not to be destroyed (cf. Matt. 13:29–30);<sup>57</sup> Peter’s net must draw to the very shore all kinds of fish if there is to be any catch at all (cf. Matt. 13:47–50).<sup>58</sup> Augustine’s tolerance towards the unworthy ones within the body of the Catholic Church—an incomprehensible offence in the eyes of the Donatists—is grounded in a trust in the infallible divine predestination and eschatological separation of the chosen members of the “Columba” from the unworthy members on the one hand, and on the conviction that God’s message entrusted to the church cannot be thwarted by the personal unworthiness of its members on the other (Augustine expresses this conviction not only in the question of the validity of baptism, but also as far as the efficacy of the annunciation of the Gospel is concerned: even an unworthy preacher can be an efficacious dispenser of the message of salvation<sup>59</sup>).

God’s grace (*gratia*), a freely given gift to man aimed at his salvation, thus goes on to gain two distinct meanings in Augustine’s polemic: it is no longer only “love poured out into our hearts by the Holy Spirit” (Rom. 5:5), which gives personal sanctification, but also the gift of serving the salvation of other men, which is not dependent on personal sanctification. For example, the apostle Peter, who denied Christ, was honoured with “such exceeding grace” (*tam excellenti gratia*), i.e., primacy among the apostles; this, however, did not prevent him from deviating from the truth and encouraging the Gentiles to be circumcised.<sup>60</sup> Cyprian, who was wrong in the question of rebaptising, did not equal Peter in the “dignity of their sees” (*cathedrarum gratia*), yet he was given the same glory of a martyr.<sup>61</sup>

In another passage, Augustine makes a distinction between the “gift of efficacy” (*munus operationis*), common to the worthy and unworthy ones (i.e., presumably “divine sacraments and utterances”, which cannot be attributed to man either within or without the Catholic Church<sup>62</sup>), and “the inner bond of charity conspicuous in those who have the Holy Spirit”, which

<sup>57</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* I,14,21: BA 28, 260; *De bapt.* IV,9,13–10,14: BA 29, 266–268.

<sup>58</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 14,35: BA 28, 604–606; *De unico bapt.* 8,14: BA 31, 694.

<sup>59</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* III,55,67: BA 30, 730.

<sup>60</sup> See *De bapt.* II,1,2: BA 29, 126; *De unico bapt.* 13,22: BA 31, 708.

<sup>61</sup> See *De bapt.* II,1,2: BA 29, 128; *De unico bapt.* 13,22: BA 31, 708–710.

<sup>62</sup> See *De bapt.* IV,11,17: BA 29, 274.

belongs only to the “Columba”, forgiving sins.<sup>63</sup> Even an unworthy Catholic minister can mediate forgiveness because it is actually the Holy Spirit who forgives through those who were endowed with him and who, therefore, despite being scattered all over the world, create the communion of true love. The real members of the “Columba”, led by the Holy Spirit and begging for “gratuitous grace” (*gratuitam gratiam*),<sup>64</sup> complement the service of an unworthy Catholic minister, though not a Donatist one, burdened with the sin of schism.<sup>65</sup>

What is of importance here is not only the distinction between the gift of valid administration of sacraments and the grace of personal sanctification, but also the ecclesiological setting of both. In Augustine’s opinion, the gift of a valid baptism appears not only outside the “Columba”, but also outside the Catholic Church, although this gift can become grace only in the “Columba” (not necessarily in the whole Catholic Church). The forgiveness of sins and personal sanctification, which are the purport of baptism, exist exclusively in the “Columba”, i.e., never in deliberate separation from the Catholic Church, although they may exist outside the Catholic Church and, by the same token, need not exist in the whole of it.

Augustine’s generous notion of the validity of baptism outside the Catholic Church is thus complemented by his (not commonplace) conviction that real love as the gift of the Holy Spirit is present only where there is no separation from this church. Not only does a valid baptism as the property of the Catholic Church bring no benefit to the Donatists, it even brings destruction to them. The optimistic words that “many who seem to be without are in reality within” rather express in their context the inscrutability of God’s predestination, which infallibly relates to the “fixed number” of the chosen ones, while the others are “more than can be numbered” and will be separated during the Day of Judgement.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> ... *illa autem columba unica pudica et casta, sponsa sine macula et ruga ... quod non intellegitur nisi in bonis et sanctis et iustis, id est non tantum secundum operationes munerum Dei bonis malisque communes, sed etiam secundum intimam et supereminentem caritatem spiritum sanctum habentibus, quibus dominus dicit: Si cui dimiseritis peccata dimittentur ei et si cui tenueritis tenebuntur* (John 20:23) (*De bapt.* VI,3,5: BA 29, 410). English translation after J.R. King, 481.

<sup>64</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,11,24: BA 28, 328–330.

<sup>65</sup> *De bapt.* VI,4,6: BA 29, 412; *De bapt.* VI,14,23: BA 29, 436.

<sup>66</sup> Augustine explicitly mentions “the fixed number of the saints” (*numerus certus sanctorum praedestinatus ante mundi constitutionem*), who are called according to God’s purpose (*secundum propositum vocati*), and the others, who are “more than can be numbered” (*super numerum*); see *De bapt.* V,27,38: BA 29, 394. Similarly also *Enarr. Psalm.* 39,10: CCL 38, 433.

4.3. *Persecution*

The whole polemic gains a very ambivalent character as a result of the persecution of the Donatists, the view on which changed radically with Augustine over the years. While at first (about 391–398) he resolutely rejected the use of coercion in the matter of faith, he then went on to learn its efficacy and did not hesitate to search for a theological justification for it. In his *Retractiones*, he even regarded it as necessary to rectify his statement in his lost work *Contra partem Donati* that schismatics must not be forced to unity. “I did not know yet” (*nondum experts eram*) how helpful it could be, he says here.<sup>67</sup>

In the anti-Donatist works it is thus possible to notice a change in Augustine’s views, which is also related to the addressees of his works. In his answer to the Donatist scholar Cresconius, Augustine holds that imperial edicts are not being implemented and it is rather the Catholics who are being treated unjustly.<sup>68</sup> The Catholics are said to disagree with the persecution of heretics,<sup>69</sup> asking merely for obedience to the sovereign both in civil and religious matters (the preservation of the unity of the church), provided the laws he passes are just.<sup>70</sup> Against the Donatist demand for religious freedom he argues that crime must be prevented even in a violent way, but always one which corresponds with humanity (*humanitas*) and love (*cari-tas*).<sup>71</sup>

In his polemic against the Donatist bishop Parmenian, Augustine presents the whole issue along the lines that although the Donatists were the first to turn to the emperor, they now defy his edicts (the confiscation of Donatist property) and must be made to comply with them by force so that public order is not endangered. Augustine even regards the imperial edicts protecting the church’s unity as a means of God’s reign, thus refusing to consider the Donatist victims as martyrs: martyrdom (or mere persecution,

---

<sup>67</sup> *Retract.* II,5: CCL 57, 93 f. On Augustine’s (changing) attitude to the persecution and violence against the Donatists, see H.A. Deane, *The Political and Social Ideas*, 185–211; P. Brown, “St. Augustine’s Attitude to Religious Coercion”, in: *JRS* 54, 1964, 107–116; E.L. Grasmück, *Coercitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit*, Bonn 1964, esp. 240–250; J.M. Rist, “Augustine”, 442–447. As these works show, violence against the Gentiles was regarded as common practice by both Augustine and his contemporaries.

<sup>68</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* III,47,51: BA 31, 378.

<sup>69</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* III,50,55: BA 31, 384.

<sup>70</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* III,51,56: BA 31, 384–386.

<sup>71</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* III,51,57: BA 31, 386–388.



for that matter) is not physical harm, but harm endured for the sake of justice. In his opinion, the Donatists do not suffer for the sake of justice, but they rightly pay for their sin of schism.<sup>72</sup>

Before the Donatist bishop Petilian, who criticises the bloody persecution as a violation of love, a false means of peace and a forcible attempt at unity,<sup>73</sup> Augustine does not hesitate to defend this action as a legitimate use of the authority of the state for the preservation of order (for that matter, not even the Donatists were reluctant to proceed in the same way against the splinter group of the Maximians<sup>74</sup>). Although it is not possible to coerce anyone to the good (as the Donatists point out), it is possible to enforce compliance with the law and thus prevent evil. Hardship may turn men from evil and the fear of punishment may set them on the right path. By the same token, it is not possible to force faith on anyone, because God gave men the freedom of choice and he “draws” them (John 6:44), as Petilian remarks. However, says Augustine, hardship may make men consider whether they are enduring it for the sake of justice, or whether they are suffering for their unworthiness, and may thus have a healing effect. Persecuted by the state, the Donatists should realise that they are suffering rightly for the schism they caused, and

---

<sup>72</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* I,9,15: BA 28, 244–246. Augustine relates the whole situation in a very similar way in his letter to the Catholic “man of arms”, Boniface, in *Ep.* 185 (also called *De correctine Donatistarum*) 2,6 ff.: CSEL 57, 5 ff.; he distinguishes here between a “persecution of unrighteousness” and a “righteous” persecution (see 2,11: CSEL 57, 10), also saying that the Donatists are obsessed with martyrdom, which they seek quite unwisely (2,11–3,12: CSEL 57, 10 f.). On what Augustine regards as persecution, see also *Ep. cath.* 15,38: BA 28, 614. Augustine compares the hardship which the Donatists endure from the Catholics to the just punishment which Sarah inflicted on Hagar (cf. Gen. 21:9–13); see e.g. *In Ioh.* 11,13–15: CCL 36, 118–120 (for this theme in Augustine’s anti-Donatist works, see A.- M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 34–37). In his sermons on the First Epistle of John, concerned with love, Augustine also says that although the Donatists complain about their persecution, they committed violence themselves by dividing the body of the church, and are therefore “betrayers” themselves (see *In Ep. Ioh.* 10,10: SC 75, 436). On Augustine’s conception of death in the context of the anti-Donatist polemic, see J.-M. Girard, *La mort chez saint Augustin. Grandes lignes de l’évolution de sa pensée, telle qu’elle apparaît dans ses traités*, Fribourg, Suisse 1992, 93–128.

<sup>73</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* II,78,173: BA 30, 430; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,68,153: BA 30, 412. Augustine does not refute Petilian’s mention of the bloody persecution; see *Contra litt. Petil.* II,23,51–52: BA 30, 288–290; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,66,147–148: BA 30, 408; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,71,159: BA 30, 416.

<sup>74</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* I,28,29: BA 30, 184; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,83,184: BA 30, 446–450; similarly *Contra Cresc.* III,52,58: BA 31, 388; *Contra Cresc.* III,59,65: BA 31, 404–406. According to Augustine, this question disconcerted the Donatists at the Carthage conference in 411 as well; see *Brev. coll. Don.* III,8,11: BA 32, 158.

admit their guilt.<sup>75</sup> By splitting from the Catholic Church, they brought “a true death” on themselves.<sup>76</sup>

Augustine’s ecclesiology thus arrives at a strange conclusion: the utility (not the validity) of baptism can be developed only in unity with the “Columba”, whose members are joined by the bond of love by the Holy Spirit. The “Columba” may cross the borders of the visible Catholic Church, but it cannot exist in deliberate disagreement with it. For the sake of the preservation of love (participation in the “Columba”), this dissension must be overcome. According to Augustine, state laws and their enforcement may also lead to this goal in the case of an emergency inasmuch as they may move men to consideration and a change in attitude.<sup>77</sup> The actions of power, paradoxically, are not supposed to be a means of obliterating a pestilent doctrine, pernicious ritual or seditious morals, but are meant to make the Donatists—who, from Augustine’s point of view, adhere to a more or less orthodox doctrine, administer a valid Christian baptism and pay particular attention to moral integrity—turn inwards, towards the unity of love and tolerance of unworthy members of the visible church. Our task, however, is not to investigate this confusing paradox of Augustine’s polemic, but its role in the doctrine of grace.

#### 4.4. *Impact on the Will and Theology of Violence*

In his argumentation against the Donatists, Augustine undoubtedly takes for granted not human action, but the antecedence, if not the decisive efficacy, of God’s grace as far as the validity of baptism is concerned. He says explicitly that we have nothing we did not receive and our faith and righteousness come from God, who can endow them even through a man lacking both.<sup>78</sup> To regard as human action what is in fact God’s gift is a

---

<sup>75</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* II,83,183–184; *BA* 30, 442–444; *Contra litt. Petil.* II,84,185–186; *BA* 30, 450–452.

<sup>76</sup> See *Contra litt. Petil.* II,23,52; *BA* 30, 288.

<sup>77</sup> In accordance with his notion of the “secular” state, however, Augustine considers the representatives of state power to be the legitimate executors of such pressure not as such, but on account of their being members of the Christian church (*Christiani imperatores*, *Ep.* 185,2,6: *CSEL* 57, 5); this pressure is actually exerted by the church, which wields the authority “not only to invite but to compel (*cogat*) men to goodness” (*Ep.* 173,10: *CSEL* 44, 647). English translation by W. Parsons, 80. Cf. also *Ep.* 185,6,23: *CSEL* 57, 21 f.); for more details, see R.A. Markus, *Saeculum*, 133–153.

<sup>78</sup> ... *bonorum omnium nihil habemus quod non accepimus, et ideo fides et iustitia nobis a Deo est. Sed cum dicis hanc tibi Deum dare non posse, nisi habeat eam homo, per quem*

fallacy causing destructive schisms, which were already fought against by the apostle Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 1:12–13).<sup>79</sup> It does not matter who plants and waters because it is God who enables the growth to take place (cf. 1 Cor. 3:7).<sup>80</sup>

However, Augustine seems to deliberately avoid the generalisation of this principle and its application to the relationship between grace and human freedom. Perhaps he did not want to introduce this difficult issue, as it was elaborated in his answer to Simplicianus, into the polemic against the Donatists. When the Donatist bishop Parmenian refers to the line in 1 Cor. 4:7 (“And what do you have that you did not receive?”) in order to support the opinion that unworthy ministers cannot give what they do not have themselves, Augustine limits himself to an account of the validity of baptism, intentionally not commenting on the right sense of the line: “For what reason and with what intention the apostle says so shows the context of his epistle—yet let us now leave it aside.”<sup>81</sup>

However, a connection between Augustine’s new doctrine of grace and the most problematic point in his anti-Donatist polemic, namely the justification of violence, cannot be ruled out. When Petilian remarks that God gives free will to men and “draws” them to himself, Augustine replies:

If I were to propose to you the question of how God the Father draws men to the Son (John 6:44), when He has left them to themselves in the freedom of the will, you would perhaps find it difficult of solution. For how does He draw them to Him if He leaves them to themselves, so that each should choose what he pleases? And yet both these facts are true; but this is a truth which few have intellect enough to penetrate. As therefore it is possible that, after leaving men to themselves in free will, the Father should yet draw them to the Son, so is it also possible that those warnings which are given by the coercion of the laws do not take away free will (*ut ea, quae legum cohercitionibus admonentur, non auferant liberum arbitrium*). For whenever a man suffers anything that is harsh and unpleasing, he is warned to consider (*ut cogitet*) why it is that he is suffering, so that, if he shall discover that he is suffering in the cause of justice, he may choose the good that consists in the very act of suffering as he does

---

*baptizaris, spem profecto in homine ponis, qui utrum sit iustitiae particeps nescis, et si non est, tunc famam eius attendis et, cum falsam bonam de malo latente reppereris, ad sanctificationem tibi sufficere credis. Obsecro te, si fiduciam Dei, non hominis habes et ideo magis ut iustus et bonus et fidelis sit, per quem hoc sacramentum celebretur, inquiris, quia Dei est fides atque iustitia ...* (*Contra Cresc.* III,9,9: BA 31, 284). This aspect of Augustine’s anti-Donatist writings is accentuated by P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 130–137.

<sup>79</sup> See *De unico bapt.* 5,7: BA 31, 676.

<sup>80</sup> *Contra Cresc.* IV,22,27: BA 31, 524.

<sup>81</sup> *Contra ep. Parm.* II,13,27: BA 28, 336–338.

in the cause of justice; but if he sees that it is unrighteousness for which he suffers, he may be induced, from the consideration that he is suffering and being tormented most fruitlessly, to change his will for the better.<sup>82</sup>

Augustine thus draws a parallel here between God's impact on the will (presumably referring to the "delight" which God invokes in man in order to move his will, as mentioned in the answer to Simplicianus<sup>83</sup>) and the effect of the coercion, which may influence the human will as well. Both of them have a bearing on the will, presumably a substantial one, but neither cancels freedom of choice.

We may notice that there is a certain difference between the two impacts on the will in Augustine's account. The efficacy of grace, as described in the answer to Simplicianus, is "affective": God sets up the circumstances so that he invokes human delight (*delectare*) in turning towards himself, and it is under this influence that the human will gives consent to this turning. In the narration of the conflict of the will in the eighth book of the *Confessions*, in the moment of conversion God strengthens the will so that it can realise the resolution which one has already arrived at in his reason and the fulfilment of which he wills.<sup>84</sup> On the other hand, coercion, as Augustine has it in the polemic against Petilian, addresses human rationality: it is supposed to make man consider (*ut cogitet*) the reason for his suffering and induce him to reassess the situation in a rational way.

The parallel of the double impact on the will thus consists in the setting of the circumstances which are to invoke an efficacious desire or a rational resolution concerning a voluntary action. However, some of Augustine's

---

<sup>82</sup> *Si tibi proponam quaestionem, quomodo Deus pater attrahat ad filium homines quos in libero dimisit arbitrio, fortassis eam difficile soluturus es. Quomodo enim attrahit, si dimittit ut quis quod voluerit eligat? Et tamen utrumque verum est, sed intellectu hoc penetrare pauci valent. Sicut ergo fieri potest ut, quos in libero dimisit arbitrio, attrahat tamen pater ad filium, sic fieri potest ut ea, quae legum coercionibus admonentur, non auferant liberum arbitrium. Quidquid enim homo durum et molestum patitur, ammonetur ut cogitet quare patiatur, ut, si pro iustitia se pati perspexerit, id ipsum bonum eligat pro iustitia talia sustinere, si autem viderit iniquitatem esse pro qua patitur, se infructuosissime laborare atque cruciari considerans mutet in melius voluntatem ...* (*Contra litt. Petil.* II,84,186: *BA* 30, 450–452). English translation after J.R. King, 574.

<sup>83</sup> See *Simpl.* I,2,21: *CCL* 44, 53 f.

<sup>84</sup> Augustine also mentions God's impact on man in a different form, employing the notion of God (or Christ) as an inner teacher who must speak to the hearts of men if the words "from without" of human teachers are to influence them (see *In Ep. Ioh.* 3,13: *SC* 75, 210; *In Ep. Ioh.* 4,1: *SC* 75, 218). This idea represents a certain association of the "affective" impact on the will and God's persuasion through argumentation; or rather, it may be the ground of both these notions, one which can be found even before Augustine's *Questions for Simplicianus* in his dialogue *On the Teacher* from 389 (see *De mag.* 14,45–46: *CCL* 29, 202 f.).

statements in his correspondence seem to suggest that what he has in mind is not only a parallel, but an actual identification of both kinds of influence: in other words, that he regards the corrections of the laws as a form of God's impact on the will of the Donatists.

As stated above, Augustine maintains that if just, imperial edicts must be respected as a means of God's reign. In order to justify the interventions of the state against the Donatists, Augustine refers to Paul's words concerning the divine origin of the governing authorities which keep the peace (Rom. 13:1–7).<sup>85</sup> In his letter to Vincentius (a member and later also the leader of the Rogatians, a splinter group from the Donatists),<sup>86</sup> he says that despite having been for a long time in favour of the solely verbal persuasion of opponents,<sup>87</sup> he knows of a number of former Donatists who now thank God for bringing them back to the Catholic Church by means of strict imperial edicts (*stimulo terroris, flagello*).<sup>88</sup> The pressure (*terror*) of the earthly authorities thus turns out to be "profitable admonition" (*utilis admonitio*),<sup>89</sup> with which it is convenient to link the salvific doctrine if the "bonds of custom" (*consuetudinis vincula*) are to be overcome.<sup>90</sup> The pressure may induce men to know the truth which they did not know before, or it may move their wills so that they will what they did not will before, thus becoming a means of correction:

Not that anyone can be good against his will (*invitus*), but, by fear of enduring what he does not want, he either gives up the hatred that stands in his way, or he is compelled to recognise the truth he did not know. So, through fear, he repudiates the false doctrine that he formerly defended, or he seeks the truth which he did not know, and he willingly (*volens*) holds now what he formerly refused (*nolebat*).<sup>91</sup>

<sup>85</sup> See *Ep.* 87,7–8: CSEL 34/2, 402 ff.

<sup>86</sup> On Vincentius, see A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 26f.

<sup>87</sup> See *Ep.* 93,5,17: CSEL 34/2, 461f., see above, chap. II.4.3.

<sup>88</sup> *His omnibus harum legum terror, quibus promulgandis reges serviunt domino in timore, ita profuit, ut nunc alii dicant: "Iam hoc volebamus; sed Deo gratias, qui nobis occasionem praebeuit iam iamque faciendi, et dilationum morulas amputavit." ... "gratias Domino, qui negligentiam nostram stimulo terroris excussit, ut saltem solliciti quaereremus, quod securi numquam nosse curavimus." ... "gratias Domino, qui trepidationem nostram flagello abstulit, expertos docuit, quam vana et inania de ecclesia sua mendax fama iactaverit"* (*Ep.* 93,5,18: CSEL 34/2, 462 f.). In another passage, Augustine says that even a stray sheep which bears a mark of where it belongs must be brought back to the flock "by threats or pain of blows" (*flagellorum terroribus vel etiam doloribus*), see *Ep.* 185 (*Correct. Donat.*) 6,23: CSEL 57, 22.

<sup>89</sup> See *Ep.* 93,6,20: CSEL 34/2, 464. In another passage, Augustine refers to the pressure of the laws as a kind of medicinal inconvenience (*medicinalis molestia*), used by God's mercy; see *Ep.* 185 (*Correct. Donat.*) 7,26: CSEL 57, 25.

<sup>90</sup> See *Ep.* 93,1,3: CSEL 34/2, 448.

<sup>91</sup> *Non quo quisque bonus possit esse invitus, sed timendo, quod non vult, pati vel relinquit impediendam animositatem vel ignoratam compellitur cognoscere veritatem, ut timens vel*

However, a strange force of habit makes some of them think that they cannot be changed for the better except under the influence of this fear (*nisi hoc terrore perculsi*), and then they turn their anxious minds to consider truth.<sup>92</sup>

God himself, says Augustine, employs the pedagogy of terror, which is a means of his love: he did not hesitate to use violence (*violentia*) to bring the apostle Paul to conversion (Acts 9:3–9),<sup>93</sup> nor was he ashamed to command his servants to seek the guests and “compel them to come in” (*cogite intrare*) (Luke 14:23). According to Christ himself, the Father “draws” people (John 6:44), i.e., by means of the “fear of the divine anger” he makes them convert.<sup>94</sup>

Do you think no one should be forced to do right (*cogi ad iustitiam*), when you read that the master of the house said to his servants: *Whomever you find, compel them to come in* (Luke 14:23); when you read also that Saul himself, afterward Paul, was forced by the great violence of Christ’s compulsion (*magna violentia Christi cogentis esse compulsus*) to acknowledge and hold the truth (cf. Acts 9:3–9)? ... Or do you think that no force should be used (*nullam vim adhibendam*) to free a man from destructive error, when you see, by the most convincing examples, that God Himself does this—and no one loves us more advantageously than He does—and when you hear Christ saying: *No man comes to me except the Father draw him* (John 6:44)? This happens in the hearts of all who turn to Him through fear of the divine anger.<sup>95</sup>

---

*respuat falsum, de quo contendebat, vel quaerat verum, quod nesciebat, et volens iam teneat, quod nolebat* (Ep. 93,5,16: CSEL 34/2, 461). English translation after W. Parsons, 72.

<sup>92</sup> *Qui tamen nescio qua vi consuetudinis nullo modo mutari in melius cogitarent, nisi hoc terrore perculsi sollicitam mentem ad considerationem veritatis intenderent* (Ep. 93,1,1: CSEL 34/2, 445 f.). English translation by W. Parsons, 57.

<sup>93</sup> On the theme of the “violent” conversion of Paul, which already appears in Augustine’s older sermons and frequently in the anti-Donatist context, see P. Brown, “St. Augustine’s Attitude”, 110.

<sup>94</sup> The expression *cogite intrare* is repeated by Augustine in this context several times; see e.g. Ep. 185 (Correct. Donat.) 6,24: CSEL 57, 23; *Serm.* 112,7,8: PL 38, 647 f.: *Coge, inquit, intrare. Foris inveniatur necessitas, nascitur intus voluntas.*

<sup>95</sup> *Putas neminem debere cogi ad iustitiam, cum legas patrem familias dixisse servis: “Quoscumque inveneritis, cogite intrare,” cum legas etiam ipsum primo Saulum postea Paulum ad cognoscendam et tenendam veritatem, magna violentia Christi cogentis esse compulsus ... Et putas nullam vim adhibendam esse homini, ut ab erroris pernicie liberetur, cum ipsum Deum, quo nemo nos utilius diligit, certissimis exemplis hoc facere videas et Christum audias dicentem: Nemo ad me venit, nisi quem pater adtraxerit, quod fit in cordibus omnium qui se ad eum divinae iracundiae timore convertunt* (Ep. 93,2,5: CSEL 34/2, 449 f.). English translation by W. Parsons, 60 f.

God even did not “spare” his own Son, but “delivered Him up” for us (Rom. 8:32), and in his death he gave his love the form of permitted violence.<sup>96</sup>

#### 4.5. *The Answer to Simplicianus and the Anti-Donatist Polemic*

This bewildering theology of violence,<sup>97</sup> elaborated at the time of the culminating anti-Donatist polemic, shows that it is not quite improper to relate Augustine’s conception of the will from the answer to Simplicianus to his notion of the impact of repressive measures of the state. What also finds considerable application in the anti-Donatist dispute is Augustine’s developing doctrine of inherited sin, which inflicts the whole of humankind.<sup>98</sup> Contrary to the Donatist idea of “contamination” with the sins of others, Augustine maintains that every man bears only his own guilt and burden (*sarcina*)<sup>99</sup> and cannot be involuntarily “infected” with the sins of others.<sup>100</sup> Nevertheless, even he holds that there is pernicious yeast which gets into “the whole lump” (1 Cor. 5:6), as the Donatists have it.<sup>101</sup> Yet it is not the individual misdemeanours of our fellows, but the pride of the father of the human race which created the single mass (*una consparsio*) of men similar to him, in which all men add their sins to the original unpropitious ferment.<sup>102</sup> Do the Donatists then regard themselves as a purified mass (*massa purgati tritici*)?<sup>103</sup> With respect to the Donatist demand that the church should be spotless, Augustine argues that all men (with the exception of Christ) are sinners inasmuch as Adam’s inheritance remains in them (*inest adhuc quod*

<sup>96</sup> See *Ep.* 93,2,7: *CSEL* 34/2, 451.

<sup>97</sup> P. Brown is disinclined to call Augustine’s thoughts on violence a “doctrine”, limiting himself to the term “attitude”; see P. Brown, “St. Augustine’s Attitude”, 107. In his opinion, it was not concerned with an indifferently declared teaching, but with issues which troubled Augustine and in which he tried to choose the lesser evil (*ibid.* 115 f.). All this notwithstanding, Augustine did arrive at a certain answer for which he also found theological substantiation.

<sup>98</sup> The role of the Donatist controversy in this matter is accentuated by J.P. Burns, *The Development*, 81f.

<sup>99</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,7,12: *BA* 28, 294. *Sarcina* refers to the load of a Roman soldier; Augustine usually uses this expression to render a mission or responsibility with which one has been entrusted; in several passages (including this one), however, it also refers to the “load of one’s life”; see M. Jourjon, “*Sarcina*. Un mot cher à l’évêque d’Hippone”, in: *RechSR* 43, 1955, 258–262.

<sup>100</sup> See above, chap. II.4.1 incl. n. 44.

<sup>101</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,22,42: *BA* 28, 380.

<sup>102</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* III,2,5: *BA* 28, 398.

<sup>103</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* III,3,18: *BA* 28, 438.

*ex Adam sumus*), and no human society can thus be flawless. To delude oneself into thinking the opposite is a mere illusion and, on top of that, pride.<sup>104</sup> Not even in the house of God are all vessels of honour; some of them are made to dishonour (*in contumeliam*, cf. Rom. 9:21), but must be endured until the ultimate separation.<sup>105</sup>

As far as the idea of God's predestination of the eternal destiny of men is concerned, we have seen that it is one of the pillars of Augustine's anti-Donatist attitude. He has no doubt that despite all the confusion and imperfections of the present church the "predestined corn" (*frumenta praedestinata*), which God foreknows, cannot die.<sup>106</sup> Moreover, the predestined ones are certainly not separated from the church.<sup>107</sup> Yet Augustine is not quite optimistic in his expectation: for all the emphasis he puts on the "catholicity of the church" and the "multitude" of nations which will be endowed with salvation (contrary to the Donatist idea of the salvation of only a small number of the pure ones), he maintains that there are many who are chosen (good), but there are even more reprobated (evil) ones (cf. Matt. 7:13–14).<sup>108</sup>

It is, however, not clear what the conception of predestination with which Augustine works is.<sup>109</sup> In certain passages he seems to settle for the notion of predestination in the sense of God's foreknowledge (*praescientia*) of future human acts, which God already sees as present.<sup>110</sup> Not even in the account of the "fixed number" of the chosen ones and the other Christians, "more than can be numbered", is it ruled out that what Augustine means by predestination is God's foreknowledge of human ways, the whole course of which is known to no man.<sup>111</sup> The conviction that Augustine expressed in the answer to Simplicianus that God alone predestined these ways, inasmuch as they are good, regardless of the human will (which, because of

<sup>104</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* II,7,13–14: BA 28, 294–298; see also *Contra ep. Parm.* II,10,20: BA 28, 312–314; *Contra Cresc.* IV,59,71: BA 31, 618.

<sup>105</sup> See *Contra ep. Parm.* III,5,26: BA 28, 460; *Contra ep. Parm.* III,5,28: BA 28, 468; *Contra litt. Petil.* III,28,33: BA 30, 652.

<sup>106</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 25,73–74: BA 28, 700–702.

<sup>107</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* II,33,42: BA 31, 248.

<sup>108</sup> See *Ep. cath.* 14,36: BA 28, 606–608. On the "good" ones as those "who are called according to His purpose" (*secundum propositionem vocati*), see *Contra Cresc.* I,34,40: BA 31, 148.

<sup>109</sup> This ambiguity is pointed out by J.P. Burns, *The Development*, 79 f.

<sup>110</sup> See *De bapt.* IV,3,4: BA 29, 240; see also *Ep. cath.* 9,23: BA 28, 560–562 (the latter passage, however, is concerned with the will of man to turn away from Christ, which God naturally does not bring on, but only foreknows).

<sup>111</sup> See *De bapt.* V,27,38: BA 29, 394–396 (on this passage, see above, chap. II.4.2 incl. nn. 52 and 66).



sin, is unfortunately unable to turn towards the good on its own), is not further developed in the Donatist dispute. On the contrary, he encourages the Donatist layman Cresconius to turn away with his own will (*conversio voluntatis*) from fallacy to the truth, from schism to unity, from discord to peace, and from hostility to love,<sup>112</sup> without going on to say that such a turn may actually be induced in the human will by God only, provided it was so ordained by him before the creation of the world.

From his answer to Simplicianus, Augustine could certainly have adopted the constituting role of divine, not human, impact in the matter of faith and applied it to the issue of the validity of baptism. In his vindication of the use of the repressive measures of the state he presumably took up the idea of suggestible will. He was also able to rely on the notion established previously concerning the inherited sinfulness of all men, from which nobody is exempt (with the exception of Christ), and thus show that any attempt at establishing a church hierarchy devoid of sin would be a mere illusion. Last but not least, the doctrine of God's predestination was employed in Augustine's ecclesiology, counting on the intermingled communion of the Catholic Church, which is already latently divided into the fixed number of the chosen ones and the other, unworthy members.

On the other hand, as far as the further development of Augustine's doctrine of grace is concerned, the clash with the Donatists highlighted (apart from the suggestibility of the will) the relationship between grace and baptism, though it is one which is far from unequivocal. Baptism as the sacrament of grace is separable from grace itself: it may be valid, and yet it need not bring grace (forgiveness of sins); by the same token, grace (conversion of one's heart) can be efficacious even without baptism. The ecclesial setting of grace is quite noticeable here as well: the grace of baptism can manifest itself only in the "Columba" as a gift of love, which rules out discord with the institution of the church. Grace as "love poured out into our hearts by the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 5:5) thus gains a new dimension of communion, even of an institutionalised one. This corresponds to the notion of the apostolic office as "grace" (*gratia apostolica, cathedrarum gratia*), which is not identical to personal holiness.

\*\*\*

The predominance of God's grace over the human will, as laid out by Augustine in the answer to Simplicianus, finds a distinct sacramentological and

---

<sup>112</sup> See *Contra Cresc.* II,9,11: BA 31, 172.

ecclesiological use in the polemic with the Donatists. In this application, grace also gains a more noticeable ecclesial setting, which was entirely lacking in the answer to Simplicianus and was not at the centre of attention in the *Confessions* and other works from this period, either. As we will see, the connection between grace and baptism will play an important role in Augustine's polemic against the Pelagians. The argument with the Donatists also adversely contributed to Augustine's emphasis on the suggestibility of the will and to the conception of grace as God's impact on the will.



PART THREE

“THE WILL IS PREPARED BY THE LORD”  
(411–430)



The anti-Pelagian controversy, which had engaged Augustine for more than the last fifteen years of his life, was not only a theological dispute but also an ecclesiastical-political one. After the fall of Rome in 410 (without which the controversy would probably have not arisen), the Italian and African churches were competing for influence over the West, but at the same time, the Christian East got embroiled in the events in various ways as well.<sup>1</sup>

It was probably Rufinus the Syrian who was present at the birth of the Pelagian position. In his work *De fide*, he argued not only against Origen's teaching on the guilty fall of the soul into the body (and other Origenian teachings), but also against the notion of Adam's guilt transmitted by the procreation of the human race.<sup>2</sup> Yet no open conflict broke out over this work of Rufinus' (conveying to the West ideas which the author may have adopted from Antiochian theology<sup>3</sup>) or even over Pelagius' ascetical activity

---

<sup>1</sup> On the development of the Pelagian dispute among the African bishops, Rome and the Eastern church, see O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975.

<sup>2</sup> See Rufinus the Syrian, *Liber de fide* 17: Miller 70–72 (against Origen's rejection of God's unlimited power); *Liber de fide* 20: Miller 78 (against Origen's idea of the fall of demons); *Liber de fide* 36; 51: Miller 108; 128–130 (against Origen's notion of human flesh as a consequence of the fall); *Liber de fide* 28: Miller 90–94 (against traducianism); *Liber de fide* 38–39: Miller 110–114 (against the transmission of Adam's guilt to his descendants). On Rufinus the Syrian (presumably a different person from his namesake Rufinus of Aquileia), see B. Altaner, "Der *Liber de fide*, ein Werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des 'Syrers'", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 467–482; H.-I. Marrou, "Les attaches orientales du Pélagianisme", in: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1968, 459–472; G. Bonner, "Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism", in: *AugSt* 1, 1970, 31–47; E. TeSelle, "Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius. Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy", in: *AugSt* 3, 1972, 61–95; C.P. Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of His Move South from Aquileia", in: *JThS*, N.S., 28, 1977, 425 f. Recently, W. Dunphy tried to identify both Rufinuses as one person, different from the author of *Liber de fide*; see W. Dunphy, "Rufinus the Syrian: Myth and Reality", in: *Augustiniana*, 59, 2009, 79–157.

<sup>3</sup> The relationship between Pelagian teachings and Theodore of Mopsuestia is attested to by an anti-Pelagian writer of that time, Marius Mercator (*Commonit.* 3.1: *ACO* I, 5, 5); see H.-I. Marrou, *Les attaches orientales* (among others, the author mentions Theodore's lost treatise against original sin; however, Theodore might have written it later, under the influence of Julian of Eclanum, who in his exile took refuge with Theodore after 419; see J. Lössl, *Julian von Aclanum. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 298); the discussion of Theodore's role at the beginning of Pelagianism is summarised in G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism*, Villanova 1972, 27 f.

among the Roman aristocracy<sup>4</sup> (although it did perhaps evoke some questions concerning the doctrine of grace, as we will see later). The first person to be condemned was Caelestius,<sup>5</sup> a disciple of Pelagius; in 411, he was charged with heresy by Deacon Paulinus of Milan, though not on Italian soil, but (significantly) in Africa, in Carthage, where Caelestius and Pelagius had taken refuge after the fall of Rome.<sup>6</sup>

In the same year, Augustine set about a written polemic against Caelestius' views, following the request of the imperial commissioner Marcellinus, and he soon went on to become acquainted with Pelagius' expositions of the Pauline letters and, later on, with his other works as well. Augustine's attitude, originally a polite attempt at discouraging both theologians, supported by the influential Roman aristocracy, from dangerous teachings,<sup>7</sup> gradually radicalised into absolute irreconcilability and a targeted ecclesiastical-political campaign.

After Pelagius left Rome for the East via Africa, Augustine sent his disciple Orosius to Jerusalem in connection with the matter of Pelagius' teachings (among others, Orosius carried a letter from Augustine and an oral

---

<sup>4</sup> On Pelagius' patrons from among the Roman aristocracy, see P. Brown, "Pelagius and His Supporters", 185–191; idem, "The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy between East and West", in: idem, *Religion and Society*, 208–226.

<sup>5</sup> *Ep.* 157,3,22: *CSEL* 44, 471. According to Augustine's account, the theses for which Caelestius was condemned were as follows: 1. Adam would have died a physical death even if he had not sinned; 2. his sin injured only himself, not the whole human race; 3. the law leads men to the kingdom of God no less than the Gospel does; 4. men lived without sin even before the coming of Christ; 5. new-born infants are in the same condition as Adam was in before his transgression; 6. the whole human race neither dies in consequence of Adam's sin nor rises again through Christ's resurrection (see Augustine, *De gest. Pel.* 11,23: *BA* 21, 484; *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,11,12: *BA* 22, 176–178). See O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 9–11. The available information concerning the destiny of Caelestius was collated by G. Honnay, "Caelestius, discipulus Pelagii", in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 271–302; on his teachings, see E. TeSelle, "Rufinus"; for an overview see also M. Lamberigts, "Pelagius and Pelagians", in: S. Ashbrook Harvey—D.G. Hunter (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, Oxford 2008, 258–279 (on Caelestius, see esp. 266 f.).

<sup>6</sup> As G. Bonner remarks, at the time of the culminating Donatist schism, the African church was probably particularly sensitive to all teachings concerning baptism, including its substantiation by means of original sin (see G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research*, 36 f.). However, Y.-M. Duval objects that it was probably already in Rome before 410 that Pelagius and his teachings caused a stir, and that in Carthage he was not indicted by the Africans, but by Deacon Paulinus of Milan. His teachings were thus suspicious not only in the African region (Y.-M. Duval, "Pélage en son temps: Données chronologiques nouvelles pour une présentation nouvelle", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 100 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> As late as 414, Augustine says in a letter to Hilary of Syracuse that the Pelagians had better be cured of their fallacy rather than be cut off as incurable members from the body of the church (*Ep.* 157,3,22: *CSEL* 44, 472).

admonition to Pelagius himself, whom Augustine had, up to then, probably intended to spare a public scandal<sup>8</sup>). However, the Palestinian episcopate turned a deaf ear to the confrontational efforts of the young priest and Pelagius' reaction was apparently not very warm either. He nevertheless accomplished his mission with Jerome in Bethlehem (according to some authors, it was Jerome, not Augustine, who launched the anti-Pelagian campaign as a follow-up to the one against Origen<sup>9</sup>). This biblical scholar and spiritual leader of Roman aristocratic women might have originally regarded Pelagius with favour during their stay in Italy, and perhaps it was he who later on sent Rufinus from Bethlehem to Italy.<sup>10</sup> But he went on to actively support the anti-Pelagian campaign<sup>11</sup> (the reason possibly being the competition between the acrimonious monk and the newcomer Pelagius, who took over his position with the Roman aristocracy for some time<sup>12</sup>). Having been charged by two Gallic bishops, Pelagius was eventually tried at

<sup>8</sup> See Y.-M. Duval, "La correspondance entre Augustin et Pélage", in: *REAug* 45, 1999, 363–384; idem, "Pélage en son temps", 113 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Jerome regarded the Pelagian zeal for perfection (*impeccantia*) as a parallel to Origen's (Stoic) aspiration to the extirpation of all passions (*apatheia*) (see R.F. Evans, *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, New York 1968, 6–25; P. Brown, "The Patrons of Pelagius", 213; C. Moreschini, "Gerolamo tra Pelagio e Origene", in: *Augustinianum*, 26, 1986, 207–216). The theological objectives of the Pelagians themselves were—paradoxically—aimed against Origen in many respects, particularly his notion of the fall of the souls, which takes place before they enter the body; this polemic made them deny the sin of newborn infants (see P. Brown, "The Patrons of Pelagius", 219 f.; see also above, part III, introduction, n. 2).

<sup>10</sup> For a reference concerning this envoy see Jerome, *Ep.* 81,2: *CSEL* 55, 107. The identification of Rufinus (the Syrian) both with the author of the treatise *De fide* and Jerome's envoy nevertheless remains a hypothesis, though a probable one (see B. Altaner, "Der Liber de fide", similarly also G. Bonner, "Pelagianism and Augustine", in: *AugSt* 23, 1992, 33–51 [reprinted in: G. Bonner, *Church*, N° VI], esp. 37; Y.-M. Duval, "Pélage en son temps", 99; for a contrary and rather exceptional point of view, see H.-I. Marrou, "Les attaches orientales", 464 f.). E. TeSelle even thinks it possible that the theology of Rufinus, aimed against the doctrine of original sin, is based not only on Antiochian theology, with which Jerome's envoy could have been familiar, but also on the teachings of the young Jerome, who was to become an opponent of the Pelagians (see E. TeSelle, "Rufinus", 66 f.). As W. Dunphy observes, Jerome understood Pelagianism as a revival of Rufinus of Aquileia's Origenism (see W. Dunphy, "Marius Mercator on Rufinus the Syrian. Was Schwartz Mistaken?", in: *Augustinianum*, 32, 1992, 279–288); there is no reason, according to Dunphy, to assume the existence of two different Rufinuses (see W. Dunphy, "Rufinus the Syrian").

<sup>11</sup> See Jerome, *Ep.* 133 *Ad Ctesiphontem* (*CSEL* 56, 241–260) and *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* (*CCL* 80), a treatise in three books from 415.

<sup>12</sup> A similar relationship between the two men is insinuated by Augustine, *Contra Iul.* II,10,36: *NBA* 18/1, 570. On this passage and Jerome's relationship to Pelagius, see Y.-M. Duval, "Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'*Adversus Iovinianum* à Rome en 393? Ou: du « portrait-robot » de l'hérétique chez s. Jérôme", in: *RHE* 75, 1980, 525–557.



the synod in the Palestinian Lydda (Diospolis) in 415, where he was rehabilitated. Augustine strongly objected to the result as a misunderstanding or deception concerning his rival's part in the treatise *De gestis Pelagii*, not hesitating to ask several popes successively to condemn Pelagius.<sup>13</sup> It was not only a personal matter: the credit of the African church and its anti-Donatist belief in the universality of the "Catholic" teachings (including the teaching on original sin) were at stake as well.<sup>14</sup>

While Pope Innocent, having examined the whole matter, complied with the requirement of the African bishops that Pelagianism should be condemned as a dangerous heresy (January 417),<sup>15</sup> his Greek successor Zosimus rehabilitated both Pelagius and his disciple Caelestius (summer 417). The African bishops reacted to this by summoning a synod in Carthage on 1 May, 418, which condemned the teachings of Caelestius and Pelagius,<sup>16</sup> and also saw an anti-Pelagian imperial edict through in 418 (a delegation in Ravenna led by the imperial commissioner Marcellinus).<sup>17</sup> It was only due to this pressure that Zosimus confirmed the decision of his predecessor, issuing on top

<sup>13</sup> Augustine addressed his first request that Pelagius reprobate his books and repudiate his teachings to Pope Innocent; see *Ep.* 177,7: *CSEL* 44, 675; *Ep.* 177,15: *CSEL* 44, 683 f.

<sup>14</sup> See G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research*, 56–59; idem, "Augustine and Pelagianism", in: *AugSt* 24, 1993, 27–47 (reprinted in: G. Bonner, *Church*, N° VII), esp. 36 f.

<sup>15</sup> See *Ep.* 181 and 182: *CSEL* 44, 701–723.

<sup>16</sup> The nine canons of this synod are concerned with the following issues: Adam's mortality before sin; infant baptism; the destiny of infants who die unbaptised (rejection of a kind of third possibility between the kingdom of heaven and condemnation); grace which does not only forgive sins, but also helps the Christian life both to gain knowledge and fulfil the commandments, not only "more easily", but fulfil them in the first place; and, finally, the rejection of the possibility of being without sin in the Pelagian sense (see *Concilia Africae*, CCL 149, 69–73; for more details see O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 169–196).

<sup>17</sup> Some authors maintain that it was *comes* Valerius of Ravenna who saw this decree through on the grounds of Augustine's plea in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, a work which he addressed to Valerius (see J. Ferguson, *Pelagius. A Historical and Theological Study*, Cambridge 1956, reprint New York 1988, 110; H.A. Deane, *The Political and Social Ideas*, 212 ff.). However, the role of Valerius in that matter is uncertain (see O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 199). J. Morris argues that the reason of the imperial condemnation of Pelagianism could have consisted in the "socialist" ideas of Caelestius' circle, requiring social equality between the rich and the poor (see J. Morris, "Pelagian Literature", in: *JThS*, N.S., 16, 1965, 43–53). This hypothesis is challenged by W. Liebeschuetz, "Did the Pelagian Movement Have Social Aims?", in: *Historia*, 12, 1963, 236 ff. (see below, p. 168, n. 10). On the other hand, J.-M. Salamito analyses the social aspects of the controversy applying Max Weber's theory and presenting "Pelagianism" as a theology of the elite and Augustine as a theologian of the multitude (J.-M. Salamito, *Les virtuoses et la multitude. Aspects sociaux de la controverse entre Augustin et les pélagiens*, Grenoble 2005). This interpretation has also been criticised as one-sided (see a review by J. Lössl, in: *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2006.02.50, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2006/2006-02-50.html>).

of that an encyclical letter (*Tractoria*) in the summer of 418. By signing it, all bishops were to confirm their anti-Pelagian attitude. Under these circumstances, Pelagius fell out of favour with the Roman priest Sixtus, his patron up to then, who later became Pope Sixtus III (432–440). To him, in a long letter (*Ep.* 194), Augustine addressed the sum of his teaching on grace,<sup>18</sup> inviting him—as one who had been lucky to realise his fallacy—to actively seek out potential Pelagian sympathisers and make them renounce the pernicious heresy as well.<sup>19</sup>

However, Zosimus' edict was rejected by eighteen Italian bishops led by Julian of Eclanum because they regarded the doctrine of original sin as a non-Christian superstition grounded in African folk religiosity. The African victory thus brought about dissension among the Italian episcopacy and a marked escalation of the whole situation. At the end of 418, Julian was excommunicated and followed Pelagius and Caelestius to the East, where he went on trying to act in the Pelagian matter.

Neither did Augustine cease to act; to the new pope, Boniface (419–422), he addressed the whole treatise of *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* in order to show that the anti-Pelagian position is grounded not only in the African but also Italian theological tradition and to exonerate himself from Julian's accusation of Manichaeism. At the same time, he faced there the Pelagian complaint that the Roman clergy set the state authorities against them.<sup>20</sup>

The new pope, Celestine (422–432), originally a proponent of the Pelagians, went on to repeat the decision of his predecessors and condemned Julian and his adherent Florus in 430, and not even the intervention of Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople, with whom Julian and his companions sought temporary refuge, made him change his mind. One year later, the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus confirmed their suspension<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> See below, p. 210f. This letter went on to raise the concern of the monks of Hadrumentum; see below, chap. III.2.10a. It even cannot be ruled out that Sixtus is the author of several Pelagian treatises which used to be attributed to Pelagius himself (*De castitate*, *De divitiis*, *De malis doctoribus*); see O. Wermelinger, "Neuere Forschungsperspektiven um Augustinus und Pelagius", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium*, 215f.

<sup>19</sup> *Ep.* 191,2: CSEL 57, 164f.

<sup>20</sup> See *Contra ep. pelag.* II,3,5: CSEL 60, 463.

<sup>21</sup> The Council of Ephesus confirmed in this respect the opinion of Pope Celestine, without elaborating on the whole matter any further (see *Collectio Vaticana*, 82,13, ACO I,1,3, 9). See also *Synodi epistula generalis de orientalibus episcopis* of the same council, which in three places obliges all clerics to disavow the teachings of Caelestius under threat

and the opponents of Augustine's doctrine of grace were no longer welcome even in the Christian East.

The essence of Pelagianism as he understood it was summarised in Augustine's late work *De haeresibus*, a guideline requested by his correspondent Quodvultdeus. This account, written in 428 (after seventeen years of the dispute), represents an instructive overview of the whole issue from Augustine's point of view:

[The Pelagians] are so opposed to the grace of God by which we are predestined to adoption as His sons through Jesus Christ (Eph. 1:5), and by which we are rescued from the power of darkness (Col. 1:13) that we may believe in Him and be transferred into His kingdom; wherefore He says: *No one can come to me, unless he is enabled to do so by My Father* (John 6:65), and by which charity is poured forth into our hearts, that faith may work through charity (cf. Rom. 5:5; Gal. 5:6); they are so opposed to this grace, I say, that they believe that man can fulfil all commandments of God without it. But, if this were true, in vain would it seem that the Lord said: *Without me, you can do nothing* (John 15:5). Accordingly, when Pelagius had been upbraided by the brethren for granting nothing to the help of God's grace in the fulfilment of His commandments, he accepted correction only up to a point. He would not put grace before (*praeponeret*) free will, but with lying subtlety, he subordinated (*supponeret*) it to free will, suggesting that grace was given to men that they might more easily (*facilius*) with the aid of grace fulfil what they are commanded to do through the exercise of free will. Certainly, in saying "that they might more easily" he intended it to be understood that men could still fulfil the divine commands without grace, though with greater difficulty

---

of suspension; these, however, are not introduced there and are presented more or less along the lines of the fallacies of Nestorius in the field of Christology (see *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo *e. a.*, Bologna 1973<sup>3</sup>, 62–64). As A. Harnack puts it, "in the Ephesian comedy Cyril (of Alexandria) accommodated the Roman envoys in having the council condemn the teachings of Caelestius, for Rome had given him consent with the condemnation of Nestorius" (A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III, 186f.). Paradoxically, it was presumably Nestorius himself who, in his correspondence with Rome, somewhat clumsily linked both matters and saw their discussion through at the Council of Ephesus, whose convocation he initiated; a factual connection between the Pelagian standpoint in the question of grace and the Christological teaching of Nestorius, as perceived by Prosper of Aquitaine, John Cassian and Marius Mercator (see H.-I. Marrou, "Les attaches orientales", 468f.) and as presumably apprehended by Augustine himself *avant la lettre* (see J. Plagnieux, "Le grief de complicité entre erreurs nestorienne et pélagienne d'Augustin à Cassien par Prosper d'Aquitaine?", in: *REAug* 2, 1956, 391–402) was not determined by the council (see J. Speigel, "Der Pelagianismus auf dem Konzil von Ephesus", in: *AHC* 1, 1969, 1–14). It remains an open question, however, what actually Nestorius' relationship was to the small group of Pelagian exiles, expelled even from his own diocese in 429 by a decree issued by the emperor Theodosius II (see M. Lamberigts, "Les évêques pélagiens déposés, Nestorius et Ephèse", in: *Augustiniana*, 35, 1985, 264–280).

(*difficilius*). But they say that that grace of God without which we can do no good is nothing else but free will itself (*liberum arbitrium*). Our nature has received this free will from God without any preceding merits of its own, and it was given to us only, that we, with the help of God through the instrumentality of His law and teaching, might learn what we ought to do and what we ought to hope for, but not that through the gifts of His Holy Spirit we should do what we have learned we ought to do. Therefore, they admit that knowledge by which ignorance is dispelled has been granted to us by God, but they deny that charity, whereby we live in a holy way, is so granted ...

They deny the efficacy of the prayers which the Church offers up, either for infidels and those who resist the teaching of God that they might be converted to God, or for the faithful that faith might be increased in them and that they might persevere in it. Indeed, they contend that men do not receive these graces from God, but possess them of themselves, claiming that the grace of God whereby we are freed from impiety is granted to us according to our own merits (*secundum merita nostra dari*) ...

They even go to such lengths as to say that the life of the just in this world is absolutely without sin, and that through them the Church of Christ is brought to perfection in this mortality so that she is absolutely without spot or wrinkle (Eph. 5:27), as though she were not the church of Christ, which cries to the Lord throughout the whole world, *Forgive us our debts* (Matt. 6:12). Moreover, they deny that infants born in Adam according to the flesh contract the stain of the old death (*contagium mortis antiquae contrahere*) at their first birth. For they maintain that they were born without the bond of original sin (*peccati originalis*), and so there is absolutely no need for them to be forgiven anything in a second birth. But they are baptised for this reason, that by being adopted in a rebirth, they may be admitted to the kingdom of God, passing from the good state to a better state, not being freed by this renovation from any sin of ancient inheritance. For although they are not baptised, the Pelagians promise them a certain life of their own outside of the kingdom of God, it is true, but an eternal and happy one.

They also say that Adam himself would have suffered bodily death (*corpore moriturum*) even if he had not sinned, and that he had died, not in punishment for his sin, but because of the condition of nature (*conditione naturae*).<sup>22</sup>

Augustine characterises the Pelagians as “opponents of the grace of God” who deny that God predestines men and saves them from perdition by giving them love capable of fulfilling the law. The Pelagians reduce grace to a gift of the free choice of the will by means of which men fulfil God’s commandments, and to the law and teaching which show them towards what they should turn in their choice. According to them, grace consists

---

<sup>22</sup> *De haer.* 87,2–7: CCL 46, 340–342. English translation after L.G. Müller, 123 f.

in the knowledge of what one should do, but not in the love which actually does it. Men must do by their choice what they have recognised as desirable; grace perhaps (as Pelagius admitted on the ground of criticism) enables them to do it “more easily”. A human being can, in their opinion, already achieve perfection, i.e., avoid sin, during their mortal life. This conviction is related to the Pelagian rejection of original sin, from which humans beings are said to be liberated by baptism as their second birth immediately following the first one. Infant baptism (which they do not challenge at all), is regarded by the Pelagians rather as an improvement of good human nature, not as unbinding from inherited guilt. Human nature, as the Pelagians have it, is not corrupted by Adam’s sin in any way, nor is physical death a punishment for this transgression; instead, it is a natural part of the human condition.

## CHAPTER ONE

### POLEMIC AGAINST PELAGIUS AND CAELESTIUS (411–418)

Augustine himself gives an account of his relationship to Pelagius when reporting on his trial in Lydda (Diospolis). He says that he first heard this saintly man praised greatly, but then learnt from trustworthy resources of concerns about his doctrine of grace. When Pelagius, upon arriving in Africa, came to Hippo, Augustine unfortunately missed him and met him only briefly at anti-Donatist conferences in Carthage.<sup>1</sup> He was, however, much concerned after reading Pelagius' book *De natura*, which was brought to him by two former disciples of Pelagius, Timasius and Jacobus, and in which it was said that God's grace consists of human good nature, endowed in its creation with the gift of the free choice of the will, and possibly also of the divine law and forgiveness of the penitent. This led Augustine to write a treatise against him (*De natura et gratia*), where, however, he did not mention his name in order to provide the saintly man with a chance of emending his teaching without causing a public nuisance.<sup>2</sup> He also addressed a polite letter to Pelagius in which he invited him to adopt a position of humility and gratitude to God.<sup>3</sup>

This account is amended with an interesting detail in Augustine's late work *De dono perseverantiae*: here it is said that back in Rome, before he left for Africa, Pelagius was alarmed by the motto of Augustine's spirituality expressed in his *Confessions*, "Grant what you command, and command what you will," and had an argument over its accuracy with an unnamed bishop, who mentioned it in his presence.<sup>4</sup> This event may presumably

---

<sup>1</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 22,46: BA 21, 532.

<sup>2</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 23,47: BA 21, 534; see also *De pecc. mer.* III,1,1: CSEL 60, 129; *Retract.* II,33: CCL 57, 117.

<sup>3</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 26,51–29,53: BA 21, 540–546; this short letter (*Ep.* 146: CSEL 44, 273 f.) is also cited here in full (*De gest. Pel.* 27–28,52: BA 21, 542–544). On this letter, see Y.-M. Duval, "La correspondance" (the author argues that it was a letter in which Augustine, with unusual politeness, reacted to Pelagius' unsuccessful attempt at a meeting in Hippo).

<sup>4</sup> *De dono persev.* 20,53: BA 24, 730. See above, chap. I.1.3 incl. n. 35 and II.2.4. Some scholars take the view that it might have been Paulinus of Nola (see P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions*, 580 incl. n. 2; P. Brown, "The Patrons of Pelagius", 211; E. TeSelle, "Rufinus", 90); others maintain it was a close friend of Augustine's, Alypius (see D. Marafioti, *L'uomo tra*

be dated to 404–405, together with the other presumed link between the two men which precedes their encounter, i.e., Pelagius' letter (now lost) to Paulinus of Nola dealing with grace, which in all likelihood Augustine knew from Paulinus, his correspondent.<sup>5</sup>

In his *Retractationes* Augustine says that he had already argued with the Pelagian position before his first anti-Pelagian work, though not in writing, but in his sermons and speeches as he did not want to start an open argument in which Pelagius' name might be discredited.<sup>6</sup> Was there, then, a covert argument between the two men before 411? Scholars are still divided over this question: on one hand, it is not quite clear what importance Augustine attached to Pelagius' teaching before 411. Perhaps, as bishop of Hippo, he was more preoccupied with the agenda of the conference with the Donatists in June of that year than the teachings of an ascetic lay Briton,<sup>7</sup> who until 410 was the spiritual leader of the Roman aristocracy.<sup>8</sup> Or was he—given the importance he had already been attaching to the doctrine of grace for fifteen years—interested in this kind of spirituality based on volitional ascetism after all?<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand, it seems certain that Pelagius was very suspicious of Augustine's doctrine of grace because he was convinced it might demotivate the ascetical efforts of men (and could perhaps be regarded as analogous to social corruption grounded in the "grace" of the powerful, not in justice considering human acts in an impartial way<sup>10</sup>). However, the precise devel-

---

*legge e grazia. Analisi teologica del "De spiritu et littera" di S. Agostino*, Brescia 1983, 34f.) or Evodius (see A. Solignac, "Autour du *De natura de Pélagie*", in: M. Soetard, ed., *Valeurs dans le stoïcisme. Du Portique à nos jours. Textes rassemblés en hommage à M. Spanneut*, Lille 1993, 182; Y.-M. Duval, "Pélage en son temps", 98f., n. 16).

<sup>5</sup> See *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,35,38: BA 22, 126; *Ep.* 186,1: CSEL 57, 46.

<sup>6</sup> See *Retract.* II,33: CCL 57, 116f. On the sermons concerned, see P.-M. Hombert, "Augustin". As for the speeches (*conlocutiones*), Augustine may be referring here e.g. to his expositions of the book of Job as recorded by his friends (see above, chap. II.3.3).

<sup>7</sup> Pelagius' origin and the cultural and political role of Pelagianism in the British Isles, which managed to free themselves from the dominion of Rome in 410, are emphasised by J.N.L. Myres, "Pelagius", and J. Morris, "Pelagian Literature", 55–60.

<sup>8</sup> This traditional image has recently been advocated by e.g. P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, IX–XIII.

<sup>9</sup> See G. Martinetto, "Les premières réactions antiaugustinienes de Pélagie", in: *REAug* 17, 1971, 83–117. The issue is summarised by B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, 24–36.

<sup>10</sup> The social-political aspect of Pelagian spirituality is emphasised by J.N.L. Myres, "Pelagius", 24–31. However, W. Liebeschuetz objects that Pelagianism was not concerned with a polemic against "grace" (not even in the sense of social favouritism) and that social aims were of no interest to it. Pelagius and his followers put all the emphasis on personal moral and spiritual perfection, not on a demand for social reforms (see W. Liebeschuetz, "Did the Pelagian Movement Have Social Aims?", 236ff.). See also above, p. 162, n. 17. On Pelagius'

opment of Pelagius' polemic against this—in his opinion, very dangerous—teaching is not quite clear.<sup>11</sup> It is already in his work *De natura* (dated to the period of Pelagius' stay in Rome, about 406)—where he shows in an argument with a fictitious opponent the possibility of avoiding sin, given to men by God in a gift of good nature and the free choice of the will—that some scholars find a hidden polemic against Augustine's doctrine of grace and the human will as it was introduced in the answer to Simplicianus and his *Confessions* (or perhaps even in Augustine's older work *De libero arbitrio*).<sup>12</sup>

The same polemical tone can presumably be found in Pelagius' expositions of the Pauline letters (from the same period),<sup>13</sup> in which Pelagius

---

personality and work, see A. Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*, Cambridge 1926 (Texts and Studies, IX/1); G. de Plinval, *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme*, Lausanne 1943; B.R. Rees, *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge 1988 (reprint 1991).

<sup>11</sup> Some scholars argue that the authorship of the work *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, ascribed to Jerome, should be attributed to Pelagius (this was maintained by G. de Plinval, "Recherches sur l'œuvre littéraire de Pélage", in: *RPh* 8 [60], 1934, 34 ff.; idem, *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélage. Suivi du traité inédit De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, Fribourg en Suisse 1947, on the authorship esp. 131–134; more recently G. Martinetto, *Les premières réactions*, 106–115). According to this hypothesis, the work was written by Pelagius between 398 and 399 as a reaction to Augustine's expositions for Simplicianus, sent to him by a friend of both men, Paulinus of Nola, who was anxious about their content. The author gives an exposition of difficult passages in Romans 9, directed against Augustine's new theology of grace, yet without naming him. The objective of the work and Pelagius' authorship are accepted as probable by some scholars (see G. Bonner, "Pelagianism", 38) but are rejected by others (see O. Wermelinger, "Neuere Forschungsperspektiven", 214; idem, s. v. "Pelagius", in: *LThK* 8, 1999<sup>3</sup>, 5–8; F.G. Nuvolone, s. v. "Pélage et Pélagianisme", in: *DSP* 12/2, 1986, 2919). On the issue of the attribution of other arguably Pelagian works, see O. Wermelinger, *Neuere Forschungsperspektiven*, 205–216; F.G. Nuvolone, s. v. "Pélage et Pélagianisme", 2889–2923.

<sup>12</sup> The fragments of Pelagius' work *De natura* are collected in *PL* 48, 598–606; they were recently revised in great detail and an attempt at a reconstruction of the whole argumentation was made by W.A. Löhr, "Pelagius' Schrift *De natura*: Rekonstruktion und Analyse", in: *RechAug* 31, 1999, 235–294. Y.-M. Duval dates the work to the period after 406; according to his hypothesis, in this work Pelagius faced the agitation raised in Rome by his teaching on grace opposing the teaching in Augustine's *Confessions* (see Y.-M. Duval, "La date du *De natura* de Pélage. Les premières étapes de la controverse sur la nature de la grâce", in: *REAug* 36, 1990, 257–283). This is also the standpoint of A. Solognac ("Autour du *De natura*"). According to W.A. Löhr, it is rather Augustine's work *De libero arbitrio* which Pelagius opposes here (see W.A. Löhr, "Pelagius' Schrift *De natura*", 291 f.).

<sup>13</sup> Pelagius, *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli*, ed. A. Souter, Cambridge 1926. More recent textual critical research (including the issue of the Vulgate text of the Pauline letters expounded by Pelagius) is summarised by O. Wermelinger, "Neuere Forschungsperspektiven", 198–201. On Pelagius' commentary, written to a large extent in a chaste style of condensed interlinear glossing, though one in which rhetorical moral-ascetic exhortations appear as well, see G. de Plinval, *Pélage*, 121–166, esp. 136 f., 164; more recently J. Tauer, "Neue Orientierungen zur Paulusexegese des Pelagius", in: *Augustinianum*, 34, 1994, 313–358.



especially drew from Origen's commentary (translated by Rufinus of Aquileia<sup>14</sup>) and another Latin commentary summarising the teachings of Greek interpreters (known today as Budapest anonymous),<sup>15</sup> but also from Augustine's older expositions from the period of his presbyterate.<sup>16</sup> In 413, Pelagius introduced the ideal of Christian ascetism as an effort to achieve perfection in the Stoic vein,<sup>17</sup> based on good nature and the free choice of the will strengthened by the gift of the law and the teaching of the Gospel, to Demetrias, a young noblewoman (a member of the Anicia family, who were open not only to his influence, but also to Jerome's and Augustine's; a hidden polemic thus appears even here).<sup>18</sup> In 415, he was exposed to a public trial in Palestine, urged by the Latin episcopate; upon his exoneration, Pelagius enunciated his position in writing (*Defensio*), which he sent to Augustine with no further comment.<sup>19</sup> He reacted to Jerome's previous grudge and polemic by a vindication in *Pro libero arbitrio* (now only in fragments).<sup>20</sup> Both these works of Pelagius', together with the records from the Palestinian

<sup>14</sup> See A.J. Smith, "The Commentary of Pelagius on Romans Compared with That of Origenes-Rufinus", in: *JThS* 20, 1919, 127–177.

<sup>15</sup> See H.J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, I–II, Freiburg i. B. 1973–1974; on the way in which Pelagius employed this commentary, see esp. I, 196–205.

<sup>16</sup> See above, chap. I.3.3. On Pelagius' inspiration by Augustine's expositions, see A.J. Smith, "The Latin Sources of the Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, Part II: The Commentary of Pelagius on Romans Compared with Augustine, *Expositio Quarundam Propositionum ex Epistula ad Romanos* and *Epistulae ad Romanos Inchoata Expositio*", in: *JThS* 20, 1919, 55–65; G. Martinetto, "Les premières réactions", 85–105. Pelagius could nevertheless have been inspired by other works by Augustine, including *Questions for Simplicianus* I,1; see A.J. Smith, "Pelagius and Augustine", in: *JThS* 31, 1930, 21–35.

<sup>17</sup> On Pelagius' "stoicism", see J.B. Valero, "El estoicismo de Pelagio", in: *Estudios eclesiásticos*, 57, 1982, 39–63; A. Solignac, "Autour du *De natura*".

<sup>18</sup> See Pelagius, *Ep. ad Demetriadem*, *PL* 30, 15–45 = *PL* 33, 1099–1121. On Demetrias, the addressee of the letter, see P. Laurence, "Proba, Juliana et Démétrias. Le christianisme des femmes de la gens Anicia dans la première moitié du V<sup>e</sup> siècle", in: *REAug* 48, 2002, 131–163. The teaching of Pelagius included in the letter is analysed by N. Cipriani, who finds in it an idea of Christian perfection as divine education (παίδεια) structured in accordance with rhetorical education as a combination of one's nature, efforts and teaching (see N. Cipriani, "La morale pelagiana e la retorica", in: *Augustinianum*, 31, 1991, 309–327). On the spirituality of this letter, see W. Löhr, "Augustin, Pelagius und der Streit um die christliche Lebensform", in: Th. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008, 221–243.

<sup>19</sup> According to Y.-M. Duval, it was this impolite act of Pelagius' which provoked Augustine into an open form of polemic (see Y.-M. Duval, "La correspondance", 364f.).

<sup>20</sup> The fragments of Pelagius' work *Pro libero arbitrio* are collected in *PL* 48, 611–613.

trial (which were sent to Augustine at his request not by John of Jerusalem, but Cyril of Alexandria<sup>21</sup>), were employed in Augustine's overtly polemical works against Pelagius called *De gestis Pelagii* and *De gratia Christi et peccato originali*, in which he did not spare his opponent any longer; on the contrary, he set out to warn their common Roman aristocratic friends against Pelagius' dangerous ideas.

The preserved works of Pelagius suggest that he put the main theological emphasis on the dialectic of the divine and human shares in salvation and Christology, directed openly both against the Arians and the Manichaeans.<sup>22</sup> Augustine's doctrines of grace and, later on, of original sin, were, in the eyes of this strictly ascetical man, who was particular about his orthodoxy, dangerously close to the Manichaean teaching on the principle of evil responsible for human transgressions. That is why he decided to argue against Augustine, regardless of the fact he was probably not particularly disposed to theological speculation and his works were more an attempt to give an orthodox foundation to the ascetical efforts of men than an elaborate theological construction.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> See Augustine, *Ep. 4\**: BA 46B, 108–116 (see also Y.-M. Duval, "Lettre 4\*", note complémentaire, *ibid.*, 430–442).

<sup>22</sup> See T. Bohlin, *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis*, Uppsala—Wiesbaden 1957; G. Bonner, "How Pelagian Was Pelagius? An Examination of the Contentions of Torgny Bohlin", in: *StPatr* 27, 1993, 237–241 (reprinted in: G. Bonner, *Church*, N° III). Western spiritual theology regarded Pelagius' efforts as "stoic pride", rejecting Pelagianism as a portent of Nietzsche's paganism in modern times and the anthropological illusions of communism (see H. Rondet, "Liberté et grâce selon saint Augustin", in: *idem, Essais sur la théologie de la grâce*, Paris 1964, 256 and 243 f.; the characterisation of Pelagianism as "proto-modern" heresy can also be found in M. Hanby, *Augustine and Modernity*, 106). Scholars who are concerned with the Lutheran understanding of the law and grace regard Pelagius' interpretation of the Pauline letters as inadequate as well (see H.H. Eßer, "Thesen und Anmerkungen zum exegetischen Paulusverständnis des Pelagius", in: E. Wolf—H. Gollwitzer—J. Hoppe, eds., *Zwischenstation. Festschrift für K. Kupisch zum 60. Geburtstag*, München 1963, 27–42). Contemporary theology nevertheless partially attempts to understand Pelagius' arguments (see G. Greshake, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz 1972; C. García-Sánchez, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation. A Study in Historical Theology* [PhD diss. Catholic University of America], Washington, D.C., 1978). An overview of the research is given by C. García-Sánchez, *Pelagius*, 25–103; O. Wermelinger, "Neuere Forschungsperspektiven", 189–198.

<sup>23</sup> As P. Brown has it, Pelagianism as a coherent doctrine originated in Augustine's mind rather than Pelagius', and this took place even before Augustine had read any of Pelagius' works (see P. Brown, *Augustine*, 345 f.).

1.1. *Inherited Sin*

(De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum)

The first work in which Augustine argues against the Pelagian (specifically, Caelestius') ideas is *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum*, addressed to his friend Marcellinus.<sup>24</sup> Flavius Marcellinus was an imperial delegate of the emperor Honorius entrusted with handling the Donatist schism in Africa. Presiding over the conference of Carthage in 411, it was Marcellinus who decided in favour of the Catholic side. In the same year, he addressed Augustine, a colleague whom he had befriended in the meantime, with questions inspired by the teaching spread in Africa by Pelagius' disciple Caelestius (who was condemned in Carthage that year) concerning human mortality, infant baptism and the possibility of human sinlessness.<sup>25</sup> Having answered Marcellinus' questions (in which he also drew from Caelestius' apology *Libellus brevissimus*, written for the Carthage trial, and another book denying sin in new-born infants<sup>26</sup>), Augustine seems to go on (in the third book of the treatise) to react to his own reading of Pelagius' exposition of the Pauline letters.

The point of departure of the work is the origin of human mortality: Would Adam have died even if he had not sinned?<sup>27</sup> In other words, is death a part of the natural human condition, or is it a consequence of sin? Was man created as a being who succumbs to death, or did he become mortal through his own fault?

<sup>24</sup> This work is dealt with in the monograph by B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, which particularly focuses on Augustine's transformation of Pauline theology.

<sup>25</sup> On Augustine's contact with Marcellinus, see M. Moreau, *Le dossier Marcellinus dans la correspondance de saint Augustin*, Paris 1973.

<sup>26</sup> Both of these sources are mentioned by Augustine himself (see *De pecc. mer.* I,34,63–64: CSEL 60, 64). The other book was, according to F. Refoulé, an anti-Origenian treatise, *Liber de fide*, ascribed to Rufinus the Syrian, which includes a passage rejecting original sin (see above, p. 159, n. 2); see F. Refoulé, "Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagiens et du *Libellus fidei* de Rufin", in: *REAug* 9, 1963, 41–49. However, as R. Dodaro observes, there is only very little accurate information concerning where Marcellinus' and Augustine's information came from, not to mention the source of information on which Caelestius' prosecutor Paulinus relied. The author presumes the existence of a whole group of like-minded Christians in Carthage in 411, who, apart from the treatise *De fide* (whether its author was Rufinus, which seems probable, or perhaps Caelestius, as some scholars maintain) could also have read Pelagius' treatise *De natura*. After Pelagius left for Palestine, Caelestius may have become their condemned spokesman because he aspired to the priesthood (see R. Dodaro, "Note on the Carthaginian Debate over Sinlessness, A.D. 411–412 (Augustine, *Pecc. mer.* 2,7,8–16,25)", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 187–202).

<sup>27</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,2,2: CSEL 60, 3.

According to some interpreters (probably Rufinus and Caelestius rather than Pelagius<sup>28</sup>), the consequence of sin as mentioned by the apostle (Rom. 5:12) is not physical death, in which the soul is separated from the body, but the subsequent eternal death of the soul. Adam's transgression did not bring about human mortality as such, but eternal death; it did not affect earthly existence itself, but inflicted eternal punishment for its fallacy. The members of Adam's race have the same initial conditions as their forefather:<sup>29</sup> if they imitate his unpropitious behaviour, they will deserve the same punishment; if they do better, they will be rewarded by eternal happiness for their good earthly life. Should physical death be punishment for sin, it would surely have to be cancelled by the forgiveness of sin, obtained in the act of baptism.<sup>30</sup>

On the contrary, Augustine is convinced that even physical death is the consequence of sin or punishment for it. Had it not been for his sin, Adam would have crossed over painlessly from his original psychosomatic existence to the eternal life of the immortal soul and spiritual body.<sup>31</sup> By his transgression, he brought not only physical death (as a painful separation of the soul from the body) and eternal death (i.e., eternal perdition) on himself,<sup>32</sup> but also the mortal character of his existence, a body "dead because of sin" (Rom. 8:10):

He says, *The body is dead*, not on account of its earthly frailness, because it has been made from the dust of the earth, but *on account of sin* (Rom. 8:10). What more could we want? He was most careful not to say "mortal" (*mortale*), but "dead" (*mortuum*).<sup>33</sup>

This last theme was already present in Augustine's older works, dealing with the punishment for the sin of the first man; now it is given more elaboration and radicalisation.<sup>34</sup> On one hand, Augustine poses the question of how the

---

<sup>28</sup> This is the opinion of J.-M. Girard (*La mort*, 135–146), who emphasises the anti-Origenian intention of these theologians.

<sup>29</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,9: CSEL 60, 10.

<sup>30</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,33,53: CSEL 60, 123.

<sup>31</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,2,2: CSEL 60, 4.

<sup>32</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,11,13: CSEL 60, 13f.

<sup>33</sup> *Corpus, inquit, mortuum est, non propter fragilitatem terrenam, quia de terrae pulvere factum est, sed propter peccatum. Quid quaerimus amplius? Et vigilantissime non ait "mortale" sed "mortuum"* (*De pecc. mer.* I,4,4: CSEL 60, 6). English translation by R.J. Teske, 35f.

<sup>34</sup> According to C.P. Bammell, in his first anti-Pelagian work Augustine was, to a large extent, inspired by Origen's exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, which he read (presumably shortly before that) in Rufinus' translation. This accounts not only for Augustine's frequent references to this biblical book, but also for some theological motifs: for example,

punishment is transmitted in the human race; on the other hand, he firmly subscribes to the view that it is not a mere punishment disadvantaging the initial conditions of men from their very birth, but (as we already know from the answer to Simplicianus) actual guilt for which each man rightly deserves eternal perdition from the moment he is born.

Against the notion of moral “imitation”, by means of which, according to his opponents, sin and, consequently, death spread in the human race (*imitatione*),<sup>35</sup> Augustine puts forward the archaic belief in the biological and moral unity of the human race and its genetic solidarity in sin and death: in the beginning, all men were “one man”, present in Adam in the moment of his transgression, and his sin is thus their own as well.<sup>36</sup> That is why it can be argued—in reverse—that sin is passed on in the members of Adam’s race by propagation (*propagatione*),<sup>37</sup> through which physical life is transmitted as well (at least life in its corporeal component). Such is Augustine’s interpretation of Paul’s line in Rom. 5:12 (according to the Latin version quoted by Augustine): ... *per unum hominem peccatum in hunc mundum intravit, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt*. (“By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so [sin] passed upon all men; in whom all have sinned.”)<sup>38</sup>

---

“the body of sin” (Rom. 6:6 and 8:3) in the sense of corporeality exposed to concupiscence transmitted by procreation, from which only Christ is exempted, and the factual impossibility of human sinlessness; see Origen, *Comm. Rom.* V,1 (on Rom. 5:12): *FC* 2/3, 44–46.52; *Comm. Rom.* V,9 (on Rom. 6:6): *FC* 2/3, 162–164; *Comm. Rom.* VI,12 (on Rom. 8:3): *FC* 2/3, 296. For more details, see C.P. Bammel, “Augustine”, 358–361 and 365–368.

<sup>35</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,9: CSEL 60, 10.

<sup>36</sup> ... *manifestum est alia esse propria cuique peccata, in quibus hi tantum peccant, quorum peccata sunt, aliud hoc unum, in quo omnes peccaverunt, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt* (*De pecc. mer.* I,10,11: CSEL 60, 12). In another passage Augustine makes it clear that all human beings bear Adam’s guilt because at the time of his transgression they were still included in the father of the human race (*traxit ergo reatum, quia unus erat cum illo et in illo*); they were not yet souls “having a separate life” (*nondum erat anima separatim vivens*) (*Ep.* 98,1: CSEL 34/2, 521).

<sup>37</sup> *Proinde apostolus cum illud peccatum ac mortem commemoraret, quae ab uno in omnes propagatione transisset, eum principem posuit, a quo propagatio generis humani sumpsit exordium* (*De pecc. mer.* I,9,9: CSEL 60, 10 f.).

<sup>38</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,10–10,11: CSEL 60, 12. Augustine’s (erroneous) exposition of *in quo* as “in whom”, i.e., in Adam, was quite common in the exegetical tradition (see B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, 321 ff.); it was only Julian of Eclanum who pointed out in the dispute the original Greek meaning ἐφ’ ᾧ = “because” (see below, chap. III.3.4). According to Pelagius, sin entered the world in Adam as an “example or form” (*exemplo vel forma*), and all who imitate him will die. However, it is somewhat exaggerated to say that it applies to “all”, for Abraham, Isaac (and Jacob) do live (cf. Luke 20:37–38; see Pelagius, *Expos. Rom.* 5,12: Souter 45). On the line in Rom. 5:12 as expounded by Pelagius and Augustine, see B. Delaroche, *Saint*

Undoubtedly, the members of Adam's race add to this inherited sin their own volitional sins, by imitation,<sup>39</sup> but these are not aimed at in Paul's line, for that would mean that sin entered the world through the devil, imitated by all who rebel against God's will, not through the first man, from whom men are descended physically.<sup>40</sup>

According to Augustine, carnal procreation is not only the means of the transmission of original sin but, because of its libidinous character (the genitals defy the control of the human mind), it is the actual medium of the transmission:<sup>41</sup> what is born in this way as the fruit of shameful concupiscence can only be "sinful flesh" (*caro peccati*). Only Christ, born from a virgin mother, whose death was not caused by sin, but obedience,<sup>42</sup> may set men free from the "sinful flesh" and provide a cure for the illness of concupiscence and the related mortality:

Thus all the children of the woman who believed the serpent, so that she was corrupted by lust, are set free from the body of this death only through the son of the Virgin who believed the angel so that she gave birth without sinful lust. ... He alone was born without sin whom the Virgin conceived without union with a man, not by the concupiscence of the flesh, but by the obedience of her mind. She alone was able to bear the medicine for our wound who did not bring forth her holy child from the wound of sin.<sup>43</sup>

---

Augustin, 142 ff., 147 ff., 212–217, 297 f., 311–314, 317, 321 ff. As far as Augustine's exposition is concerned, many scholars point out that the bishop of Hippo did not draw the doctrine on shared (inherited) sin from an erroneous interpretation of a single biblical line only, but he arrived at it by theological deduction based on earlier tradition (see S. Lyonnet, "Rom. V,12 chez saint Augustin. Note sur l'élaboration de la doctrine Augustinienne du péché originel", in: *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père de Lubac*, I, Paris 1963, 327–339; idem, "A propos de Romains 5,12 dans l'œuvre de s. Augustin. Note complémentaire", in: *Biblica*, 45, 1964, 541–542; idem, "Augustin et Rm 5,12 avant la controverse pélagienne. A propos d'un texte de saint Augustin sur le baptême des enfants", in: *NRTh* 89, 1967, 842–850; similarly also G. Di Palma, "Ancora sull'interpretazione agostiniana di Rom 5,12: *et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt*", in: *Augustinianum*, 44, 2004, 113–134).

<sup>39</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,10: CSEL 60, 11.

<sup>40</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,9: CSEL 60, 10; *De pecc. mer.* I,13,17: CSEL 60, 17.

<sup>41</sup> *Quod igitur in membris corporis mortis huius inoboedienter movetur totumque animum in se deiectum conatur adtrahere et neque cum mens voluerit exsurgit neque cum mens voluerit conquiescit, hoc est malum peccati, cum quo nascitur omnis homo* (*De pecc. mer.* I,29,57: CSEL 60, 56).

<sup>42</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,31,51: CSEL 60, 122.

<sup>43</sup> ... *omnes filios mulieris, quae serpenti credidit, ut libidine corrumperetur, non liberari a corpore mortis huius nisi per filium virginis, quae angelo credidit, ut sine libidine fetaretur. ... Solus sine peccato natus est, quem sine virili complexu non concupiscentia carnis, sed oboedientia mentis virgo concepit; sola nostro vulnere medicinam parere potuit, quae non ex peccati vulnere germen piae prolis emisit* (*De pecc. mer.* I,28,56–29,57: CSEL 60, 55–57). English translation by R.J. Teske, 66 f.

Just as all men have sinned in one man, it is in one man that they are justified (cf. Rom. 5:18); or rather, to be more precise, only they are justified who are meant to be justified, according to Augustine. Thus through the fault of one man, all are born in sinful flesh to death, and through the sinless flesh of one man, they are born in spiritual birth again to justification.<sup>44</sup>

All generations thus pass on (or all together they make up) “sinful flesh”, which also brings about their condemnation (*ad damnationem*).<sup>45</sup> This notion is mainly based on the practice of the baptism of infants, who, in Augustine’s opinion (in which he followed Cyprian and which was also expressed by Jerome), must be baptised immediately after their birth so that they are not eternally damned in the event of an early death.<sup>46</sup> Infant baptism, Augustine says, proves that children, without actual sins of their own, are born with “original sin” (*peccatum originale*), for which they may be justly condemned—it is through baptism that a remission of sins takes place (with infants it is only original sin, while with adults this also includes actual, personal sins):

Take any little ones then. If they are already with Christ, why are they baptized? But if—as the truth maintains—they are baptized so that they may be with Christ, those who are not baptized are certainly not with Christ. And since they are not with Christ, they are against him. We must not and cannot, after all, undermine or change his statement which is quite clear (cf. Matt. 12:30). Why, then, are they against Christ, if not because of sin? It is not, after

<sup>44</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,28,55: CSEL 60, 54f.

<sup>45</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,28,55: CSEL 60, 54.

<sup>46</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,16,21: CSEL 60, 20; *De pecc. mer.* I,19,24: CSEL 60, 23f.; *De pecc. mer.* I,20,28: CSEL 60, 27; *De pecc. mer.* III,4,7: CSEL 60, 133f.; reference to Cyprian (*Ep.* 64 [to Fidus]: CCL 3C, 418–425) and Jerome (*In Ionam*, 3,5: CCL 76, 406; *Adv. Iovin.* II: PL 23, 284a–b) *De pecc. mer.* III,5,10–7,13: CSEL 60, 135–140.—The link between the ideas of inherited guilt and infant baptism, which cancels it, appears in *In Ep. Ioh.* 4,11 (SC 75, 240) from 407 and in *Ep.* 98,1 (CSEL 34/2, 521) to Bishop Boniface, the datation of which, however, is not certain (408, 411 or even 413?). On the development of the notion of inherited guilt and its connection with infant baptism, see B. Delaroche, *Saint Augustin*, 347–356. V. Grossi (“Il peccato originale”, 350–354 and 359; idem, *La liturgia battesimale*, 20–38) finds this connection even in *De cat. rud.* (esp. 26,52). The last author sees in the idea of an objective efficacy of the baptism a connection between Augustine’s polemics against the Donatists and, subsequently, against the Pelagians (cf. V. Grossi, “Il battesimo e la polemica pelagiana negli anni 411/413”, in: *Augustinianum*, 9, 1969, 30–61; idem, *La liturgia battesimale*, 78–85). On the African background of the idea of inherited guilt removed by baptism, see G. Bonner, “Les origines africaines de la doctrine augustinienne sur la chute et le péché originel”, in: *Augustinus*, ed. I. Oroz-Reta, Madrid 1967, 97–116, esp. 113–116.

all, because of their body and soul, each of which is God's creation. Moreover, if it is because of sin, what sin is found in that age but that original and ancient sin? There is in fact one sinful flesh in which all are born for condemnation ...<sup>47</sup>

Moreover, baptism is preceded by exorcism, which proves that infants are under the devil's influence and belong "in the devil's family".<sup>48</sup>

Augustine regards as an unprecedented innovation the notion of his opponents that children only accept baptism so that they may be sanctified (*ut sanctificentur in Christo*), not for the remission of sins, as they have none yet.<sup>49</sup> having no will, they cannot sin, and there is no inherited sin at all.<sup>50</sup> What people pass on from one to another in generation is merely the flesh. Thus, if there were inherited sin, it would only pertain to the body, not to the soul, which is created anew by God every time. Why should it be accused of a sin committed by someone else and punished for it?<sup>51</sup> Moreover, baptised parents, whose sin was remitted, cannot transmit what they do not possess themselves.<sup>52</sup>

Opposing this very rational notion, which commits the destiny of men (somewhat naively perhaps) into their own hands, Augustine puts up the idea of the inherited burden of Adam's sons, suffering from their ancestor's sin from their very birth. Through the grace of the divine redeemer, given in the act of baptism, the sin loses its nature of attributable guilt (*reatus*) and the subsequent eternal perdition, but its consequences, i.e., concupiscence and mortality, still remain.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>47</sup> *Constituere igitur quemlibet parvulum: si iam cum Christo est, ut quid baptizatur? Si autem, quod habet veritas, ideo baptizatur, ut sit cum Christo, profecto non baptizatus non est cum Christo et, quia non est cum Christo, adversus Christum est; neque enim eius tam manifestam debemus aut possumus infirmare vel immutare sententiam. Unde igitur adversus Christum, si non ex peccato? Neque enim ex corpore et anima, quae utraque Dei creatura est. Porro si ex peccato, quod in illa aetate nisi originale et antiquum? Una est quippe caro peccati, in qua omnes ad damnationem nascuntur ...* (*De pecc. mer.* I,28,55; *CSEL* 60, 54). English translation by R.J. Teske, 65 f. See also *De pecc. mer.* I,34,64; *CSEL* 60, 64 f.

<sup>48</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,34,63; *CSEL* 60, 63 f. On the role of baptismal exorcism in the context of Augustine's doctrine on original sin, see V. Grossi, *La liturgia battesimale*, 53–55.

<sup>49</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,6,12; *CSEL* 60, 139.

<sup>50</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,9,9; *CSEL* 60, 10; *De pecc. mer.* I,34,64; *CSEL* 60, 64.

<sup>51</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,3,5; *CSEL* 60, 132.

<sup>52</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,3,5; *CSEL* 60, 132; *De pecc. mer.* III,8,16; *CSEL* 60, 141.

<sup>53</sup> ... *adhuc manente lege concupiscentiae reatus eius solvitur et non erit, cum fit in baptismo plena remissio peccatorum* (*De pecc. mer.* II,28,46; *CSEL* 60, 117). See the whole passage in *De pecc. mer.* II,28,45–46; *CSEL* 60, 116 f.



Even baptised people succumb to the death of the body,<sup>54</sup> although death as a rightful punishment is already overcome and will be overcome completely in the resurrection of the body one day.<sup>55</sup> By the same token, even baptised people are burdened with concupiscence, with which they have to struggle until the end of their days.<sup>56</sup> It is through concupiscence (not through the power of their rebirth) that they give birth to their children, who are thus burdened with it themselves and, unless baptised, also carry the attributable guilt as members of Adam's race. Just as a circumcised father begets uncircumcised sons and chaff still remains in the grain from the winnowed wheat, so are the children of baptised parents, says Augustine, burdened again not only with the consequences of Adam's sin (which remain in the parents as well), but also with its guilt.<sup>57</sup>

Augustine thus seems to regard the flesh (*corpus mortis, caro peccati*) as the proper domain of original sin. That is why the divine healer of this fatal disease came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3) in order to overcome sin and conquer death in the resurrection of the body.<sup>58</sup> Augustine cannot say for sure how the soul becomes involved in such misery because he is not able to answer the intricate question of its origin: Does God create the souls anew, as his opponents have it, or *ex traduce*, i.e., from the souls of their parents? However much the latter solution seems to fit in with his notion of inherited guilt, Augustine did not manage to settle on it until the very end (we will come back to this later). What he was certain about was only the fact that the guilt of the souls cannot originate in God even if he did create the souls anew: therefore, the guilt is either transmitted to them from their parents' souls, from which they are created, or they are bound by the guilt immediately after their "being mingled with" the flesh in the womb, where, newly created, they are sent.<sup>59</sup>

There is another issue concerning the agenda of the Pelagian dispute with which Augustine deals in his first anti-Pelagian work, namely the possibility of human sinlessness. As his opponents argue, it is possible to avoid sin as a result of the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) with which human nature is endowed.<sup>60</sup> On the contrary, Augustine maintains that

<sup>54</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,13,23: CSEL 60, 150.

<sup>55</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,11,20: CSEL 60, 146 f.

<sup>56</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,4,4: CSEL 60, 73 f.

<sup>57</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,8,16–9,17: CSEL 60, 142–144; *De pecc. mer.* III,12,21: CSEL 60, 149.

<sup>58</sup> *De pecc. mer.* III,12,21: CSEL 60, 148; *De pecc. mer.* I,28,56: CSEL 60, 55.

<sup>59</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,36,59: CSEL 60, 127 f.

<sup>60</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,2,2: CSEL 60, 72.

concupiscence, which remains and persists in the mortal body even after baptism, is the source of ongoing transgressions, supposing, however, that one does not struggle with it, but yields to it.<sup>61</sup> In the continuous struggle, says Augustine, men cannot win on their own, but must be supported by God's help. God gives what he commands, but men are still responsible for their failure. Just as the light enables one to see without causing the darkness, so does God help men in their conversion without being guilty of its opposite.<sup>62</sup> Augustine makes it clear that God does not work our salvation in us as in stones or animals, but supports human efforts, in other words, human will.<sup>63</sup> It is not a reward for human merits when some hear the grace of Christ preached and some not; faith, nevertheless, is a matter of the human will.<sup>64</sup>

With God's help, men could theoretically avoid sin,<sup>65</sup> yet Augustine does not believe it has ever (with the exception of Christ) been achieved by anyone, referring also to the declaration in 1 John 1:8. The renewal of men is in fact slow; even after their baptism they do not free themselves from their entire burden, but must struggle with it continuously, as we already know. Only after their resurrection will men become fully (and not only by hope) the children of God.<sup>66</sup> This gradual renewal is caused by grace, as it is not within human powers. All men now know, now do not know, now find delight, now do not find delight in beginning, continuing, and completing good work, in order that they may know that it is not due to their own will, but to the gift of God, that they do so.<sup>67</sup>

In the human will itself there is no good thing which men did not receive and could thus regard as their own merits;<sup>68</sup> God himself gives the good will to men, not only the will as such, which may be used to the wrong end:

Hence, we must maintain not only that the choice of will, which freely turns this way and that and which belongs to the natural goods which a bad person can misuse, but also that good will, which already belongs to those goods which cannot be misused, can come to us only from God. ... For, if we have

<sup>61</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,4,4: CSEL 60, 73 f.

<sup>62</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,5,5: CSEL 60, 75 f.

<sup>63</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,5,6: CSEL 60, 76 f.

<sup>64</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,22,31: CSEL 60, 29 ff.

<sup>65</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,6,7: CSEL 60, 77.

<sup>66</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,8,10: CSEL 60, 81 f.

<sup>67</sup> *Ideo quisque nostrum bonum opus suscipere, agere, implere nunc scit, nunc nescit, nunc delectatur, nunc non delectatur, ut noverit non suae facultatis, sed divini muneris esse vel quod scit vel quod delectatur, ac sic ab elationis vanitate sanetur* (*De pecc. mer.* II,17,27: CSEL 60, 100).

<sup>68</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,18,28: CSEL 60, 100.

from God a free will that can become either good or bad, while the good will comes from us, what comes from us is better than what comes from God. But if that is a ridiculous claim to make, we must admit that we obtain a good will from God.<sup>69</sup>

The will which turns towards God is God's gift, while the opposite will is our own act.<sup>70</sup> Thus those who are not assisted by grace in finding efficacious delight in what is right and act in the wrong way can only blame themselves.<sup>71</sup> On the other hand, as Augustine admits, it remains a mystery why God endows one with the turning of the will and not another, why he supports one in his efforts and not another.<sup>72</sup> God does not grant his help with respect to human merits: his mercy is granted on the ground of grace. With their own acts, men only deserve perdition, to which some of them seem to be predestined (*damnandi praedestinati*):

But it is due to God's grace helping the human will that we come to know what is hidden and find pleasing what was not attractive. The reason why human beings are not helped by his grace lies in them, not in God. They were, after all, predestined either to be damned on account of their sinful pride or to face judgment and correction for their pride, if they are children of mercy.<sup>73</sup>

It cannot be said why God wants to turn some men to himself and punish others for turning away of their own accord or why he predestined some to condemnation for their pride and took mercy upon others, their pride notwithstanding, just as it cannot be said why, of two infants, one is baptised and saved, while the other one, not baptised, is condemned. However, Augustine says that in no way is God unjust.<sup>74</sup> Perhaps God refuses to grant

---

<sup>69</sup> ... *obtaineamus non solum voluntatis arbitrium, quod huc atque illuc liberum flectitur atque in eis naturalibus bonis est, quibus et male uti malus potest, sed etiam voluntatem bonam, quae iam in eis bonis est, quorum esse usus non potest malus, nisi ex Deo nobis esse non posse ... Nam si nobis libera quaedam voluntas ex Deo est, quae adhuc potest esse vel bona vel mala, bona vero voluntas ex nobis est, melius est id quod a nobis quam quod ab illo est. Quod si absurdissime dicitur, oportet fateamur etiam bonam voluntatem nos divinitus adipisci* (*De pecc. mer.* II,18,30: CSEL 60, 101). English translation by R.J. Teske, 99f. See the whole passage in *De pecc. mer.* II,18,29–30: CSEL 60, 101.

<sup>70</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,18,31: CSEL 60, 102.

<sup>71</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,17,26: CSEL 60, 99.

<sup>72</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,5,6: CSEL 60, 77.

<sup>73</sup> *Ut autem imotescat quod latebat et suave fiat quod non delectabat, gratiae Dei est, qua hominum adiuvat voluntates; qua ut non adiuventur, in ipsis itidem causa est, non in Deo, sive damnandi praedestinati sunt propter iniquitatem superbiae sive contra ipsam suam superbiam iudicandi et erudiendi, si filii sunt misericordiae* (*De pecc. mer.* II,17,26: CSEL 60, 99). English translation by R.J. Teske, 98.

<sup>74</sup> *De pecc. mer.* I,21,29–30: CSEL 60, 27–29; *De pecc. mer.* II,18,31–32: CSEL 60, 102f.

his help sometimes to make it clear that it comes from him lest someone should regard as his own merit what was a freely given gift of grace.<sup>75</sup>

The very first anti-Pelagian work by Augustine thus suggests that his “apology of grace”, faithfully following up on his answer to Simplicianus, will also intensify the two unpleasant consequences of his doctrine, namely the notion of God’s predestination, entirely independent of human acts, and the idea of the condemnable guilt of all men from their very birth. The grace which Augustine advocates is thus by no means “cheap”: it must be paid for not only by crowds of condemned unbaptised infants and the doctrine of original sin passed on through libidinous procreation, but also by the image of a God who does not provide his help to every human being. What also remains unsolved for the time being is the relationship between the human will and God’s grace: on one hand, the human will is the place of the actual responsibility of men (faith is a matter of the will); on the other hand, no man can have a good will without God’s help, which is clearly not given to all men.

### 1.2. *God Persuades the Will* (*De spiritu et littera*)

The relationship of the will and grace is the purport of the following anti-Pelagian treatise, *De spiritu et littera*, which was also addressed to Marcellinus. Augustine mainly argues against the biblical hermeneutics of the “opponents of the grace of God”<sup>76</sup> (who still remain anonymous) as he learnt about it from Pelagius’ expositions of the Pauline letters.<sup>77</sup> It was probably this treatise of Augustine’s which, eleven centuries later, drew the attention of Martin Luther.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>75</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II, 19, 32–33: CSEL 60, 103 f.

<sup>76</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 35, 63: CSEL 60, 222.

<sup>77</sup> See especially Pelagius, *Expos. Rom.* 3, 20–31: Souter 32–35. It is in this light that Augustine’s work is interpreted by I. Bochet, “« La lettre tue, L’Esprit vivifie »». L’exégèse augustinienne de 2 Co 3, 6”, in: *NRTh* 114, 1992, 341–370; eadem, *Le firmament*, 57–89; see also the monograph by D. Marafioti, *L’uomo*. On the “hermeneutic revolution” in this work, see G. Lettieri, *L’altro Agostino*, 307–333.

<sup>78</sup> See D. Marafioti, *L’uomo*, 47 ff. M. Luther regarded Augustine’s conflict with the Pelagians as a wonderful opportunity, one which “roused” this otherwise “tedious and feeble doctor” and “turned him into a man” (M. Luther, *Tischreden* [*D. Martin Luthers Werke*], vol. V, Weimar 1919, 414, § 5978, and vol. IV, Weimar 1916, 56; see also G. Bonner, *Augustine*, 28 f.). Being in favour with Luther, this treatise was also frequently quoted in the documents of the Council of Trent (see M.M. López García, “El *De spiritu et littera* en el Concilio de Trento”, in: *Augustinianum*, 43, 2003, 201–217).

In this case, the point of departure is the Pauline question concerning the relationship of the law and grace, with which Augustine had already dealt extensively in his older works. The dispute with the Pelagians nevertheless enabled him to intensify his conception. According to Augustine's account, the Pelagians maintained that a human being can attain righteousness and happiness through the free choice of the will and the knowledge of God's commandments. Grace, which aids men in this, is thus limited to the gift of the free choice of the will and the law, together with the more perfect divine revelation in the example of Christ, which makes it possible to decide towards what one should aim the free choice of the will.<sup>79</sup>

Contrary to this (again very rational) conception, Augustine sets out to emphasise the role of grace, which not only gives the knowledge of commandments or the promise of a reward,<sup>80</sup> but also helps to fulfil them: what matters here is not just the knowledge of what is righteous and good for men, but delight (*delectatio*) in the supreme good and love of it (*dilectio*). This, however, does not arise from human nature with the free choice of the will or the "outward" gift of the law, but from grace, poured "inwardly" into the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5).<sup>81</sup> The "new law" of the Gospel of Christ is not written on stone tablets (like the Decalogue in the Old Testament), but in the hearts of men with the finger of God, i.e., the Holy Spirit.<sup>82</sup> This does not mean that it is a different law (as the Manichaeans have it, rejecting the Old Testament, and as Pelagius presumably suggests, regarding the "acts of the law", which do not lead to salvation, as Old Testament

<sup>79</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 2,4: CSEL 60, 156f.

<sup>80</sup> Pelagius expounds God's impact on the will (*operatur velle*) as "persuasion and a promise of a reward"; see *Expos. in Phil.* 2,13: Souter 400.

<sup>81</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 3,5: CSEL 60, 157. See also *De spir. et litt.* 19,32: CSEL 60, 185f.; *De spir. et litt.* 25,42: CSEL 60, 196. The pneumatological conception of grace in this treatise, which is clearly related to the emphasis on its affective nature and which was lacking in the earlier work *De peccatorum meritis*, is pointed out by V.H. Drecoll, "Mens-notitia-amor. Gnadenlehre und Trinitätslehre in *De Trinitate* IX and in *De peccatorum meritis* / *De spiritu et littera*", in: J. Brachtendorf (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild*, 137–153.

<sup>82</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 21,36: CSEL 60, 189f. See also *De spir. et litt.* 24,41: CSEL 60, 194. According to the apostle, the Gentiles also have the law "written in their hearts" (see Rom. 2:14–15), but in Augustine's opinion this does not mean they can be justified without grace (*De spir. et litt.* 26,43–44: CSEL 60, 196–198). The law written *naturaliter* in their hearts, i.e., the image of God or rationality, was corrupted by sin and requires renewal: it must be written again by Christian grace even though its residue lasts (*De spir. et litt.* 28,48: CSEL 60, 202f.).

rites, abandoned in Christianity<sup>83</sup>)—all that changes is the relationship to it. The law given “outwardly” is a command with its authority based on fear, while the law given “inwardly” is obeyed out of love; men find delight in it of their own accord.<sup>84</sup> In this respect, grace—and, according to Augustine, grace only—makes it possible for men to fulfil the law which, in itself, remains the letter that kills (cf. 2 Cor. 3:6).<sup>85</sup>

While according to the “law of works” (Rom. 3:27) God only commands man, “Do what I command” (*fac quod iubeo*), by the law of faith we say to God, “Grant what you command” (*da quod iubes*).<sup>86</sup> God then gives what he himself commanded, “inspiring into the soul the sweetness of His grace” (*inspirata gratiae suavitatem*) and thus allowing men to find more delight in what the law commands than what it forbids.<sup>87</sup> God is no longer only a teacher (*doctor*), but a real helper (*adiutor*);<sup>88</sup> he does not merely forbid concupiscence (cf. Rom. 7:7), but provides efficacious assistance in overcoming it:

But if the Holy Spirit does not provide help, substituting good desire for evil desire, that is, pouring out love in our hearts, though the law is good, it increases the evil desire by its prohibition.<sup>89</sup>

Concupiscence (which, for Augustine, encapsulates the whole misery of the human condition) cannot be conquered by orthodox teaching and threats of the law, but only with the healing help of the Holy Spirit.<sup>90</sup>

The assistance is provided by God for free (*gratuito*), for it justifies men without any previous merits and bestows the gift of the Holy Spirit freely.<sup>91</sup> Good works of men are not a condition of grace, but its fruit: God does not bestow his grace because men are righteous, but so that they could become such:

---

<sup>83</sup> See Pelagius, *Expos. Rom.* 3,20: Souter 32; *Expos. Rom.* 3,27: Souter 34. Augustine’s polemic: *De spir. et litt.* 14,23: CSEL 60, 176 f.; similarly also *De spir. et litt.* 8,14: CSEL 60, 166; for more details, see D. Marafioti, *L’uomo*, 102–108.

<sup>84</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 17,29: CSEL 60, 182 f.; *De spir. et litt.* 25,42: CSEL 60, 196. On the dialectic of *delectatio*—*dilectio* see D. Marafioti, *L’uomo*, 123.

<sup>85</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 19,32: CSEL 60, 185 f.

<sup>86</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 13,22: CSEL 60, 175.

<sup>87</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 29,51: CSEL 60, 208.

<sup>88</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 6,9: CSEL 60, 161.

<sup>89</sup> *Sed ubi sanctus non adiuuat spiritus inspirans pro concupiscentia mala concupiscentiam bonam, hoc est caritatem diffundens in cordibus nostris, profecto illa lex quamvis bona augeat prohibendo desiderium malum* (*De spir. et litt.* 4,6: CSEL 60, 158). English translation by R.J. Teske, 152.

<sup>90</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 8,13: CSEL 60, 166.

<sup>91</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 8,13: CSEL 60, 165.

We must rather understand, *Those who observe the law will be justified* (Rom. 2:13) so that we realize that they fulfilled the law only because they are justified. Thus justification does not follow upon the observance of the law; rather, justification precedes the observance of the law.<sup>92</sup>

True piety and worship of God (*pietas* and *theosebeia* or *cultus*) thus consist in gratitude for God's mercy, or, in other words, in the knowledge that men have no good things of their own but were endowed with them.<sup>93</sup> To put it in a different way, true worship consists in Augustine's doctrine on grace.

Augustine does not maintain that freely given salvation and the ensuing accomplishment of the law by the love that is poured can be achieved without free will; however, the human will must be cured by grace and thus become truly free (*gratia sanat voluntatem*):

For the law is not fulfilled without free choice. But *knowledge of sin came through the law* (Rom. 3:20); through faith we obtain grace to struggle against sin; through grace the soul is healed from the wound of sin; through the good health of the soul we have freedom of choice; through free choice we have the love of righteousness; through the love of righteousness we fulfill the law. The law is not done away with, but strengthened by faith, because faith obtains the grace by which we fulfill the law. In the same way, free choice is not done away with by grace, but strengthened, because grace heals the will by which we freely love righteousness.<sup>94</sup>

In this respect the law cannot be accomplished without God's grace or the human will, for that matter (*ut sanet gratia voluntatem et sana voluntas impleat legem*).<sup>95</sup>

In the attempt to describe more precisely the relationship of God's grace and the human will in the act of faith, through which men appropriate the freely given justification by God, Augustine poses the questions he was concerned with more than fifteen years previously in his answer to

---

<sup>92</sup> *Sed sic intellegendum est factores legis iustificabuntur, ut sciamus aliter eos non esse factores legis, nisi iustificentur, ut non iustificatio factoribus accedat, sed ut factores iustificatio praecedat* (*De spir. et litt.* 26,45: CSEL 60, 199). English translation by R.J. Teske, 178.

<sup>93</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 11,18: CSEL 60, 170 f.

<sup>94</sup> *Neque enim lex inpletur nisi libero arbitrio. Sed per legem cognitio peccati, per fidem inpetratio gratiae contra peccatum, per gratiam sanatio animae a vitio peccati, per animae sanitatem libertas arbitrii, per liberum arbitrium iustitiae dilectio, per iustitiae dilectionem legis operatio. Ac per hoc, sicut lex non evacuatur, sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides inpetrat gratiam, qua lex inpletur, ita liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam, sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem, qua iustitia libere diligitur* (*De spir. et litt.* 30,52: CSEL 60, 208). English translation by R.J. Teske, 185.

<sup>95</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 9,15: CSEL 60, 168.

Simplicianus:<sup>96</sup> Is the will by which we believe a gift of God, or is it solely the act of the free choice of the will? Men surely do not have anything they did not receive (1 Cor. 4:7), but at the same time, they do not have the right to make excuses if they did not receive it. Love is freely given by the Holy Spirit, but men must believe.<sup>97</sup> Faith is thus “in our power” (*in potestate*), although it is also given to us by God because it is he who bestows the “power” (*posse, potestas*). “There is no power but from God”; such is Augustine’s somewhat surprising interpretation of Paul’s line in Rom. 13:1. What does arise from us is our will (*velle, voluntas*) to use the power, as without it every power remains a mere possibility (*potestas*).<sup>98</sup> Only when the roles are divided in this way is it possible to ascribe the freedom of the will to men without being ungrateful for mercy.<sup>99</sup>

However, even the will by which we believe, Augustine goes on to say, is God’s gift:

... [T]his will [by which we believe] is to be attributed to God’s gift, not only because it arises from the free choice which is created in us as part of our nature, but also because God brings it about by the enticements of our perceptions (*visorum suasionibus*) that we will and that we believe.<sup>100</sup>

It does not arise from free choice as part of human nature, but God himself “acts upon us”, “persuades” us by the “incentives of our fantasy” (*suasiones visorum*) both by external summons and internal thoughts. God influences what comes to people’s minds and in this artful manner summons men (*suasio vel vocatio*). Nevertheless, whether we yield our consent to his persuasion or withhold it (*consentire vel dissentire*) is a matter of our will.<sup>101</sup>

Thus the will to believe (the realisation of the opportunity given by God) is bestowed by God as well; men can either give their consent (*consentire vocationi*) or reject the persuasion. The act of receiving (*accipere*) is therefore an act of the human will.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>96</sup> The parallels of both expositions are shown by D. Marafioti, *L'uomo*, 216–221.

<sup>97</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 33,57: CSEL 60, 215 f.

<sup>98</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 31,53–54: CSEL 60, 209–212.

<sup>99</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 33,59: CSEL 60, 219.

<sup>100</sup> ... *non ideo tantum istam voluntatem [qua credimus] divino muneritribuendam, quia ex libero arbitrio est, quod nobis naturaliter concreatum est, verum etiam quod visorum suasionibus agit Deus, ut velimus et ut credamus* (*De spir. et litt.* 34,60: CSEL 60, 220). English translation by R.J. Teske, 192.

<sup>101</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 34,60: CSEL 60, 220.

<sup>102</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 34,60: CSEL 60, 220. This conclusion of Augustine’s investigation in *De spiritu et littera* is emphasised by X. Léon-Dufour, who, however, leaves aside the fact that it is eventually God himself who decides whose will he will persuade to consent and whose



For all that, Augustine admits that it remains a mystery why some men are so persuaded as to yield (*ita suadeatur ut persuadeatur*), while with others God seems to deliberately choose such a strategy as is bound to fail:

Now if someone should press us to examine the profound question of why one person is stirred to the point of being convinced (*ita suadeatur ut persuadeatur*), while another is not, there occur to me at the moment only two answers that I would want to make, *O the depth of the riches!* (Rom. 11:33) and *Is there injustice in God?* (Rom. 9:14). Those who are displeased with this reply should look for people who are more learned, but they should beware that they do not find someone more presumptuous.<sup>103</sup>

On one hand, God foreknows and has predetermined who he will call in such an efficacious way that, with the aid of their own will, he might justify them;<sup>104</sup> on the other hand, he desires all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4), and unfaithfulness (the absence of faith) contradicts his will. But even in the latter case, God's will remains "invincible" (*invicta*) as those who do not follow it will experience it as a just punishment.<sup>105</sup> (In fact, however, such a man will be punished because God did not adopt a sufficiently ingenious strategy to persuade his will.)

These aporias, with which, for the time being, Augustine overwhelms the reader, can probably be escaped in several ways: (1) God divided people before the creation of the world into the chosen and reprobated ones, and their actions (although volitional) merely fulfil a pre-established plan (God influences the human will and he himself decides whether he will succeed); (2) God wants all people to be saved, but cannot (does not want to) realise it without their will, which he does not (does not want to) determine wholly; (3) God desires all people to be saved and he does (without actually taking their will into consideration) realise it; or (4) the cooperation of God's grace and the human will needs to be interpreted in such a way as to differ from Augustine's.

---

not (see X. Léon-Dufour, "Grâce et libre arbitre chez saint Augustin. A propos de: *Consentire vocationi Dei ... propriae voluntatis est*", in: *RechSR* 33, 1946, 129–163).

<sup>103</sup> *Iam si ad illam profunditatem scrutandam quisquam nos coartet, cur illi ita suadeatur ut persuadeatur, illi autem non ita, duo sola occurrunt interim quae respondere mihi placeat: "O altitudo divitiarum" et: "Numquid iniquitas apud Deum"? Cui responsio ista displicet quaerat doctiores, sed caveat, ne inveniat praesumptores* (*De spir. et litt.* 34,60; CSEL 60, 220 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 192.

<sup>104</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 5,7: CSEL 60, 159.

<sup>105</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 33,58: CSEL 60, 216 f.

It was in his answer to Simplicianus (I.2) that Augustine actually settled for the first option, on which he only elaborates in his anti-Pelagian writings. However, in order to make his solution consistent, he will have to deal with the New Testament notion of a God who wants all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4). In the treatise *De spiritu et littera* he has so far managed to draw up a conception of the will in which human action is said to have a volitional character (human beings are not manipulated like a stone, nor do they act involuntarily<sup>106</sup>), yet one which also includes the intervention of grace, persuading the will and deciding at the same time whether it will succeed in persuading it.

In comparison with the answer to Simplicianus (I.2), the treatise under discussion puts more emphasis on the affective nature of God's impact on the will: God "persuades" a human being not by means of rational arguments but by what he "brings to his mind", by invoking "delight" or "desire", by "inspiring sweetness" into him. This affective impact on the will is also called "good desire" (*concupiscentia bona*) by Augustine.<sup>107</sup> Unusual though the turn may seem, it might account for the source of Augustine's affective conception of the will. Because of its inherited burden, the human will is so ill with concupiscence that it can only be cured, i.e., moved to the good, by even stronger and more invincible "concupiscence": divine love, which the Holy Spirit pours out into the hearts of men who believed in their own helplessness and exposed themselves entirely to the impact of God's grace. Against the sober and optimistic notion of his opponents trusting the power of natural human freedom supported by the divine law, Augustine puts forth his dramatic vision of a man tortured by concupiscence and on the verge of helplessness, whom only the "sweetness" of grace and divine affective impact on the will can entice into the love which fulfils the law.

### 1.3. *Wounded Nature* (*De natura et gratia*)

It is not only the conception of grace as "affectively" experienced love which differentiates Augustine from the Pelagians, but also his teaching on human nature (*natura*). According to Pelagius' work *De natura*, brought to Augustine by Pelagius' own disciples Timasius and Jacobus, alarmed by his

<sup>106</sup> Augustine nevertheless remarks that even enforced action (*invitus facere*) is volitional: such a man would prefer to do something else and acts under pressure, but he still acts with his own will (*De spir. et litt.* 31,53: CSEL 60, 210).

<sup>107</sup> *De spir. et litt.* 4,6: CSEL 60, 158.

teachings, human nature itself is grace, enabling men to lead a virtuous life,<sup>108</sup> i.e., a life without sin.<sup>109</sup> For if sin is voluntary and can therefore be avoided by one's will<sup>110</sup> (Pelagius refers here to Augustine's own conception of sin from *De libero arbitrio*<sup>111</sup>), grace, in the form of nature and the free choice of the will, is sufficient for a human being to attain a sinless life. Just as the ability to speak is inherent in our nature, while the act of speaking is of one's own will,<sup>112</sup> so the capacity of not sinning (*posse non peccare*) does not lie in the power of the will but in human nature itself (*necessitate naturae*); it is only its performance which is an act of the free choice of the will:

"But since the ability not to sin does not come from us, even if we will not to be able not to sin, we cannot fail to have the ability not to sin."<sup>113</sup>

"The ability not to sin lies not so much in the power of choice as in the necessity of nature. Whatever lies in the necessity of nature undoubtedly pertains to the author of nature, namely, God" [quotes Augustine].<sup>114</sup>

Pelagius naturally takes human failure into consideration, but in his opinion, it is not a substance and cannot therefore change human nature as such;<sup>115</sup> thus, the sin of the first man is not passed on by procreation, but by imitation.<sup>116</sup> Moreover, one's own imperfections can be removed in a volitional way; for example, ignorance may be overcome by diligence.<sup>117</sup>

As we already know, Augustine does not share this moral optimism, nor does he regard sin as such an innocent thing. The human being from

<sup>108</sup> *De nat. grat.* 11,12: CSEL 60, 240; *De nat. grat.* 53,62: CSEL 60, 278f.

<sup>109</sup> *De nat. grat.* 7,8: CSEL 60, 237.

<sup>110</sup> *De nat. grat.* 30,34: CSEL 60, 258.

<sup>111</sup> *De nat. grat.* 67,80: CSEL 60, 293; cf. *De lib. arb.* III,18,50,170–171: CCL 29, 304. In his *Retractiones* (I,9,3–4: CCL 57, 26) Augustine says that although in this passage he did not stress the importance of grace with respect to the will, his position was not identical to that of Pelagius anyway.

<sup>112</sup> *De nat. grat.* 45,53: CSEL 60, 271f.

<sup>113</sup> "*Quia vero posse non peccare nostrum non est, et, si voluerimus non posse non peccare, non possumus non posse non peccare*" (*De nat. grat.* 49,57: CSEL 60, 275). English translation by R.J. Teske, 253.

<sup>114</sup> "*Ipsa, inquit "non peccandi possibilitas non tam in arbitrii potestate quam in naturae necessitate est. Quicquid in naturae necessitate positum est, ad naturae pertinere non dubitatur auctorem, utique Deum"* (*De nat. grat.* 51,59: CSEL 60, 276). English translation by R.J. Teske, 254.

<sup>115</sup> *De nat. grat.* 19,21: CSEL 60, 246.

<sup>116</sup> ... "*non damnatur, inquit, "quia in Adam peccasse omnes non propter peccatum nascendi origine adtractum, sed propter imitationem dictum est"* (*De nat. grat.* 9,10: CSEL 60, 238).

<sup>117</sup> *De nat. grat.* 17,19: CSEL 60, 245.

Pelagius' account, perfect in his nature and unburdened in the choice of his will, is, in Augustine's opinion, only Adam in the Garden of Eden. However, his unpropitious volitional act did not harm only himself, but weakened the whole of human nature, which is now, as a just punishment, burdened with his sin (*originale peccatum*) and thus corrupted (*natura vitata*). The will of the first man was so powerful that it "wounded" the whole of human nature (*natura vulnerata*):

But the defect which darkens and weakens those natural goods so that there is need for enlightenment and healing did not come from its blameless maker. It came from the original sin which was committed by free choice. And thus a nature subject to punishment (*natura poenalis*) is part of a punishment that is completely just.<sup>118</sup>

That nature has been injured (*vitata*) ...; it begs the physician.<sup>119</sup>

See the injury which the will's disobedience has inflicted upon human nature. Let him pray to be healed! Why does he expect so much from the ability of nature? It is wounded, injured, beaten, ruined (*vulnerata, sauciata, vexata, perdita*); it is in need of a true confession, not of a false defense.<sup>120</sup>

Yet it is not in the power of the weakened nature or the will, which arises from it, to recover.<sup>121</sup> Men cannot be healed through the same capacity (*potestas*) as that which ruined their health but need a physician instead.<sup>122</sup> It is true that sin is not a substance; nor is lack of food (or an illness), and yet it can damage the body irreversibly, just as disobedience corrupted human nature.<sup>123</sup>

It is therefore not enough to praise God as a creator; human beings must seek refuge with him as a saviour. It would be a mistake to show our gratitude to him for having created us so much as to despise the therapy of the divine saviour, says Augustine.<sup>124</sup> Should human nature (the natural law)

<sup>118</sup> *Vitium vero, quod ista naturalia bona contenebrat et infirmat, ut inluminatio et curatione opus habeat, non ab inculpabili artifice contractum est, sed ex originali peccato, quod commissum est libero arbitrio. Ac per hoc natura poenalis ad vindictam iustissimam pertinet* (*De nat. grat.* 3,3: CSEL 60, 235). English translation by R.J. Teske, 226.

<sup>119</sup> *Vitiata est natura ..., medicum implorat* (*De nat. grat.* 49,57: CSEL 60, 275). English translation by R.J. Teske, 254.

<sup>120</sup> *Ecce quod vitium naturae humanae inoboedientia voluntatis inflixit. Orare sinatur, ut sanetur. Quid tantum de naturae possibilitate praesumitur? Vulnerata, sauciata, vexata, perdita est: vera confessione, non falsa defensione opus habet* (*De nat. grat.* 53,62: CSEL 60, 279). English translation by R.J. Teske, 256.

<sup>121</sup> *De nat. grat.* 34,39: CSEL 60, 262.

<sup>122</sup> *De nat. grat.* 30,34: CSEL 60, 258; *De nat. grat.* 23,25: CSEL 60, 251.

<sup>123</sup> *De nat. grat.* 20,22: CSEL 60, 247 f.

<sup>124</sup> *De nat. grat.* 34,39: CSEL 60, 261 f.

and the free choice of the will suffice for salvation, then Christ died in vain (Gal. 2:21) and men need not become Christians at all.<sup>125</sup>

However, Augustine makes it clear that men cannot escape their misery on their own. Human nature, being sick, is prone to fallacy and transgression of the law, to which it succumbs when left by itself (Rom. 1:18–32).<sup>126</sup> Man's body ceases to obey him because he himself resisted his creator.<sup>127</sup> Carnal concupiscence ("the law in his members") hinders his good intentions ("the law of the mind") (Rom. 7:23);<sup>128</sup> he even cannot tame his tongue (cf. James 3:8).<sup>129</sup> He lacks the light of righteousness,<sup>130</sup> his will is so weak that it does not do what it would,<sup>131</sup> and his diligence is unable to overcome ignorance.<sup>132</sup> Although men imposed this misery on themselves (in the forefather of their race, with whom humankind constitutes one "mass"<sup>133</sup>), they cannot set themselves free, but need a saviour instead; they need God's grace<sup>134</sup> to cure them,<sup>135</sup> to support them in their struggle with concupiscence<sup>136</sup> and to help them to avoid sin.<sup>137</sup> In its sickness, human nature must thus be cured and supported by grace if men are to attain righteousness.<sup>138</sup>

What Augustine means by human righteousness is not virtuous action as such (for a man can fulfil the content of the law and still be "guilty in his will" if he only wants to avoid punishment), but only virtuous action motivated by love. This cannot be given to men by their nature, says Augustine, but solely by the Holy Spirit, who works in their hearts.<sup>139</sup>

Augustine's treatise on human nature, sick with sin, and healing grace not only reveals another aspect of his dispute with the Pelagians, but also illustrates his growing conviction that his doctrine of grace is the core of Christianity, which may seem as precarious as the doctrine itself. Naturally,

<sup>125</sup> *De nat. grat.* 9,10: CSEL 60, 238f.

<sup>126</sup> *De nat. grat.* 22,24–23,25: CSEL 60, 249ff.

<sup>127</sup> *De nat. grat.* 25,28: CSEL 60, 254.

<sup>128</sup> *De nat. grat.* 55,65: CSEL 60, 282.

<sup>129</sup> *De nat. grat.* 15,16: CSEL 60, 242f.

<sup>130</sup> *De nat. grat.* 23,25: CSEL 60, 251.

<sup>131</sup> *De nat. grat.* 50,58: CSEL 60, 275.

<sup>132</sup> *De nat. grat.* 17,19: CSEL 60, 245.

<sup>133</sup> ... *ea damnatione, quae per universam massam currit* (*De nat. grat.* 8,9: CSEL 60, 238).

<sup>134</sup> *De nat. grat.* 53,61: CSEL 60, 278.

<sup>135</sup> *De nat. grat.* 11,12: CSEL 60, 240.

<sup>136</sup> *De nat. grat.* 38,45: CSEL 60, 266f.

<sup>137</sup> *De nat. grat.* 44,51: CSEL 60, 271.

<sup>138</sup> ... *ipsa natura gratia Dei per Iesum Christum dominum nostrum vel sanatur, quia vitata est, vel quia sibi non sufficit adiuvatur* (*De nat. grat.* 59,69: CSEL 60, 285).

<sup>139</sup> *De nat. grat.* 57,67: CSEL 60, 283f.

one may doubt whether the Pelagian moral optimism does justice to the entire experience of human weakness and the whole range of human evil. On the other hand, Augustine's doctrine on the radical nature of human helplessness does not fully correspond to the common moral experience (even men who were not endowed with the message of grace can tame their tongues sometimes, not necessarily with a perverted intention). Moreover, the Christian message is thus tied down in quite a dangerous way: for Christianity to be meaningful, men must be blind in their reason, helpless in their will and mortally wounded in their nature. Denying the radicalism would then mean despising redemption as such and challenging the meaning of the coming of Christ and his death.

1.4. *Can Man Avoid Sin?*  
(*De perfectione iustitiae hominis*)

The impulse to continue in the polemic against Caelestius, now openly, came from the Spanish bishops Eutropius and Paul, who sent Augustine a book or an excerpt from it (*chartula*) called *Definitiones Caelestii*,<sup>140</sup> originating from Sicily (where Caelestius presumably stayed for some time). The disciple of Pelagius explains in it that because of the volitional character of sin it can be avoided of one's own will. Men must not be blamed for what cannot be avoided<sup>141</sup> because what comes from necessity and not from the free choice of the will is not sin.<sup>142</sup> Yet sin is not part of human nature (*naturale*), or a separate thing (*res*), but is accidental (*accidens*), an act (*actus*) which is not an inherent part of human nature and can thus be avoided.<sup>143</sup> Moreover, it must be possible to avoid it if man is commanded to do so (for why should God command something that cannot be done?)<sup>144</sup> by the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*), which God created as good and which therefore is not prone (*pronus est*) to evil more than to the good.<sup>145</sup> Thus men, says Caelestius, are able to avoid sin in both forms, i.e., are able not to do what is forbidden and to do what is commanded.<sup>146</sup> It

<sup>140</sup> *De perf. iust.* 1,1: BA 21, 126. For more details, see O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 31–35. On the other works of Caelestius, now predominantly lost and hardly reconstructible, see G. de Plinval—J. de la Tullaye, “Les écrits de Célestius” (note complémentaire 17), in: BA 21, 592 f.

<sup>141</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,1: BA 21, 128.

<sup>142</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,2: BA 21, 128; *De perf. iust.* 4,9: BA 21, 136.

<sup>143</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,3–4: BA 21, 130.

<sup>144</sup> *De perf. iust.* 3,5–8: BA 21, 132–136.

<sup>145</sup> *De perf. iust.* 4,9: BA 21, 136.

<sup>146</sup> *De perf. iust.* 5,11: BA 21, 140.

follows that being without sin is not hindered by human nature (for it was created as good: who, apart from Marcion or Mani, would deny this?<sup>147</sup>) or the human will, as it can be controlled.<sup>148</sup> If man cannot be without sin, is it someone else's fault?<sup>149</sup> And could he be blamed by a righteous God for a sin which he was not able to avoid by his will?<sup>150</sup> Being without sin is therefore possible, Caelestius concludes, and since it is possible, it can be attained by every man.<sup>151</sup>

It is not difficult to anticipate Augustine's answer to this logical analysis along the lines of his previous arguments against Pelagius. Perhaps it may be summarised to the effect that the human condition is not logical (a statement which, were it not taken to extremes, would be quite convincing).

Undoubtedly, human nature was created as good, without sin as an inherent part of it, but since man corrupted it by his will, sin now unfortunately belongs to his corrupted nature (*naturale non esse peccatum, sed naturae, praesertim vitatae*).<sup>152</sup> From the free choice of the will arose necessity (cf. Ps. 24:17 LXX, V), which prevents men from understanding or doing what they want:

But this defective state that is a punishment and has arisen from freedom has produced a necessity. ... Having become subject to these necessities, either we cannot know what we are to will or, despite our willing, we are unable to do what we know. ... [B]ecause the will sinned, there came upon the sinner the hard necessity of having sin ...<sup>153</sup>

The free choice of the will is no longer fully in charge of itself; men are split in their wanting between the "flesh" and "spirit", and do not do what they will (Rom. 7; Gal. 5:17).<sup>154</sup> This human condition was caused by the will, but by the past one, which cannot be undone.<sup>155</sup> The will has thus thrown humankind into a situation which it cannot overcome on its own.<sup>156</sup>

<sup>147</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,14: BA 21, 146.

<sup>148</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,12: BA 21, 142.

<sup>149</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,13: BA 21, 144.

<sup>150</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,15: BA 21, 146.

<sup>151</sup> *De perf. iust.* 7,16: BA 21, 148.

<sup>152</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,3: BA 21, 130.

<sup>153</sup> ... *poenalis vitiositas subsecuta ex libertate fecit necessitatem ... Sub quibus [necessitatibus] positi vel non possumus quod volumus intellegere vel quod intellexerimus volumus nec valeamus implere ... Quia vero peccavit voluntas, secuta est peccantem peccatum habendi dura necessitas ...* (*De perf. iust.* 4,9: BA 21, 138). English translation by R.J. Teske, 292.

<sup>154</sup> *In tantum enim sana non est, in quantum id quod faciendum est aut caecitate non videt aut infirmitate non implet, dum caro concupiscit adversus spiritum et spiritus adversus carnem, ut ea quae vult homo non faciat* (*De perf. iust.* 2,1: BA 21, 128).

<sup>155</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,15: BA 21, 148.

<sup>156</sup> *De perf. iust.* 6,13: BA 21, 144–146.

Just as an illness of the body is neither natural nor a separate thing, and is not a single act, either (although it arose from such an act), but is rather a “bad property” (*qualitas mala*), causing defects in the acts arising from it, so is vice a kind of persisting illness which comes into existence in single evil acts.<sup>157</sup> The illness can only be cured by God’s grace,<sup>158</sup> which must heal the will so that it can avoid sin.<sup>159</sup> To command one to avoid sin is like telling a lame man to get well. He “ought to”: Does it mean that he is able to? He will be able to do so, says Augustine, only if he seeks treatment; this is his true obligation.<sup>160</sup> By the same token, men ill with sin must seek the help of grace, given to them by God in the coming of Christ. Only in this way will they do what the commandment asks them to do, i.e., avoid sin.<sup>161</sup> The fact that God wants men to be without sin does not mean, according to Augustine, that men are capable of attaining it on their own, but that they are assisted by God:

We make progress in order that we might be perfect in every respect without any infirmity of sin. God not only wills this healing, but even causes it and provides his help to complete it. And this healing is produced with our cooperation *by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, our Lord* (Rom. 7:25), not merely by commandments, sacraments, and examples, but also by the Holy Spirit, by whom in a hidden manner *love is poured out in our hearts* (Rom. 5:5).<sup>162</sup>

To be without sin is thus possible, but only with the help of grace. If it were possible to avoid sin even without it, then Christ died in vain (Gal. 2:21).<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> ... *peccatum quidem actum dici et esse, non rem. Sed etiam in corpore claudicatio eadem ratione actus est, non res, quoniam res pes ipse vel corpus vel homo est, qui pede vitiato claudicat nec tamen vitare potest claudicationem, nisi habuerit sanatum pedem. Quod etiam in interiore homine fieri potest ... Ipsum sane vitium, quo claudicat homo, nec pes est nec corpus nec homo nec ipsa claudicatio, quae utique non est, quando non ambulat, cum tamen insit vitium, quo fit claudicatio, quando ambulat. Quaerat ergo, quod eidem vitio nomen inponat, utrum rem velit dicere an actum an rei potius qualitatem malam, qua deformis actus existit. Sic et in homine interiore animus res est, rapina actus est, avaritia vitium est, id est qualitas, secundum quam malus est animus, etiam quando nihil agit ...* (*De perf. iust.* 2,4: BA 21, 130–132).

<sup>158</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,4: BA 21, 132.

<sup>159</sup> *De perf. iust.* 2,3: BA 21, 130.

<sup>160</sup> *De perf. iust.* 3,5–6: BA 21, 132–134.

<sup>161</sup> *De perf. iust.* 3,7: BA 21, 134.

<sup>162</sup> ... *ut omni ex parte perfecti sine ulla simus omnino infirmitate peccati, quod non solum vult Deus, verum etiam ut impleatur facit atque adiuvat. Et hoc nobiscum agit gratia Dei per Iesum Christum dominum nostrum non solum praeceptis, sacramentis, exemplis, sed etiam spiritu sancto, per quem latenter diffunditur caritas in cordibus nostris* (*De perf. iust.* 20,43: BA 21, 214). English translation by R.J. Teske, 314.

<sup>163</sup> *De perf. iust.* 7,16: BA 21, 148–150.



The problem is, Augustine continues, that the human will and nature are not healed by grace all at once so that men could avoid sin immediately; on the contrary, the growth of men to perfection is gradual.<sup>164</sup> Men pursue their course to perfection (cf. Phil. 3:12–14); they will never attain its fullness in this life, but only in the one to come.<sup>165</sup> In the mortal body sin still persists in its consequence, i.e., concupiscence. Even if men managed to face their improper desire by means of grace, they would never succeed in eradicating it in this life. In this respect, they will never be “without sin”, however much they avoid it:

They do not lack the power to do good, but to realize it completely. Insofar as they do not consent to desire, they do good, and insofar as they hate their concupiscence, they do good. ... Nonetheless, they do not have the power to realize the good completely, because that will come about when the concupiscence which dwells in their members no longer exists.<sup>166</sup>

The “sin” burdening men until the very end of their days is naturally not a single act of the will (unlike Adam’s sin), but a kind of unpropitious component of the human condition (*res mala*; cf. Job 1:1<sup>167</sup>), one tempting men into further acts.

The difference between Augustine’s and Caelestius’ positions thus does not only consist in their views on how sin can be avoided (whether on the ground of the free choice of the will arising from human nature, or on the ground of the free choice of the will healed by grace) or whether this can be attained fully (according to Augustine, it is not fully possible in a mortal body), but also in the conception of sin itself. In Caelestius’ opinion it is a single act of the will, which can be avoided by the will; Augustine maintains that there was such an act at the very beginning (in the case of the first man), but now it is its permanent sediment in the form of concupiscence, together with other acts conditioned by concupiscence and approved by

---

<sup>164</sup> *De perf. iust.* 4,10: BA 21, 140. In his letter to Jerome (dated to the same period as the treatise discussed here, i.e., 415) Augustine, along the lines of his polemic against the Stoics, says that the acquisition of virtue is not as definite as emerging from water into the air, but is rather gradual, like passing from the darkness into the light (*Ep.* 167,3,12–13: CSEL 44, 599 ff.).

<sup>165</sup> *De perf. iust.* 8,19: BA 21, 156–158. On Augustine’s application of the lines in Phil. 3:13–14, see N. Cipriani, “L’utilizzazione di Fil. 3,13–14 nell’ opera di s. Agostino”, in: *Augustiniana*, 56, 2006, 299–320.

<sup>166</sup> *Non facere bonum non adiacet, sed perficere. Nam in eo quod non consentit, bonum facit; et in eo quod odit concupiscentiam suam, bonum facit. ... Ei tamen perficere bonum non adiacet, quod tunc erit, quando concupiscentia illa quae habitat in membris eius nulla erit* (*De perf. iust.* 11,28: BA 21, 176). English translation by R.J. Teske, 303.

<sup>167</sup> *De perf. iust.* 12,29: BA 21, 178.

the corrupted will. With the help of grace, the convalescent human will may abstain from the consent to temptation, but it cannot remove the sediment of sin manifesting itself in persisting concupiscence.

### 1.5. *Pelagius' "Hypocrisy"* (De gestis Pelagii)

At the trial in the Palestinian Lydda (Diospolis) in 415, Pelagius, examined by fourteen Eastern bishops presided over by the Palestinian primate Eulogius of Caesarea, either explained or rejected teachings which were attributed to him<sup>168</sup> and was vindicated, while his teaching was condemned as being that of Caelestius. This was regarded by Augustine as a clear work of Pelagius' artful hypocrisy. As Pelagius' subsequent letters show, he continues to teach the same as before, i.e., maintains the teaching condemned in Diospolis, only with the qualification that some of the arguable sentences were not written by him, but Caelestius.<sup>169</sup>

As we know from Augustine's account, the agenda of the trial consisted of the following issues: in what sense the law helps men to avoid sin (i.e., in what sense God helps the free choice of the will to choose good); whether God forgives the sinners on Judgement Day; whether the righteous men of the Old Testament may enter the kingdom of God; whether men, provided they want to, can avoid sin; whether some men lived holy and righteous lives even before the coming of Christ; whether God endows with all graces those who are worthy (e.g. the apostle Paul); whether Adam would have been mortal if he had not sinned; whether Adam's sin caused harm only to himself, or to the whole human race; whether children are born in the same condition as Adam before his sin; whether through Adam's sin the whole human race dies, just as it rises again through Christ's resurrection; whether infants, even if they die unbaptised, may attain eternal life; whether the rich must give up their property in order to be saved;<sup>170</sup> whether we may do on our own even more than is commanded; whether grace is needed for single deeds or consists only in human good nature, the free choice of the will, the

<sup>168</sup> The text of the charge, brought by two exiled bishops from Gaul, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, is quoted by O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 71–73.

<sup>169</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 20,45: BA 21, 532; *De gest. Pel.* 30,54: BA 21, 546; *De gest. Pel.* 31,56: BA 21, 554; *De gest. Pel.* 33,57–58: BA 21, 556–558.

<sup>170</sup> On the role of social equality in the Caelestian circle, see J. Morris, "Pelagian Literature", 43–53. Cf. also the polemic of W. Liebeschuetz, "Did the Pelagian Movement Have Social Aims?" (see above, p. 162, n. 17).

law and teaching; whether grace is bestowed according to human merits; whether only those men who are entirely without sin can be called the sons of God; whether forgetfulness and ignorance are sins even though they are not volitional; whether grace is necessary for good works, or just the free choice of the will, and whether being “partakers of the divine nature” (2 Pet. 1:4) means that the soul is “somehow God” (*quemadmodum deus*).<sup>171</sup>

Augustine’s exposition consists of three levels: a contentious statement (in some cases Caelestius’, from whose assertions the majority of the issues above are drawn<sup>172</sup>), Pelagius’ explanation (or his disavowal), and Augustine’s commentary. In connection with our theme, only those issues will be discussed which illuminate the delimitation of Augustine’s position with respect to the Pelagian one and vice versa.

As for Pelagius’ general statement that the law helps men to avoid sin by showing them what to do and what to avoid,<sup>173</sup> Augustine remarks that there are two kinds of “aids” (*adiutorium*): the indispensable ones, without which the result could not be attained (e.g. sailing would not be possible without a ship), and the auxiliary ones, which help but are not indispensable for the attainment of the goal (e.g. a “pedagogue” can help children to find their way to school). While grace aids a life without sin in the former sense, the knowledge of the law does so in the latter one.<sup>174</sup> However, Pelagius’ statement elsewhere to the effect that grace enables one to obey the commandments of God easily (*facile*) seems to suggest that grace belongs to the latter group of “aids” as well. On the contrary, Augustine holds that man cannot obey the commandments without God’s grace, and even if he is endowed with it, he does not obey them “easily”, but only with labour (*Quomodo ergo facile fit, si laboratur ut fiat?*).<sup>175</sup> Caelestius’ conviction that men are able to do more on their own than what is commanded (e.g. to maintain a state of virginity) is, in Augustine’s opinion, sheer bragging.<sup>176</sup>

Even Pelagius maintains that God helps free will to choose the good, while only free will is responsible for sin<sup>177</sup>—yet it does not follow that when men do not choose good it is due to the absence of grace.<sup>178</sup> At the same

<sup>171</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 35,62–65; BA 21, 566–576 *et passim*.

<sup>172</sup> On the theses of Caelestius condemned in Carthage in 411, see above, p. 160, n. 5.

<sup>173</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 1,2; BA 21, 434.

<sup>174</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 1,3; BA 21, 436–438.

<sup>175</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 30,55; BA 21, 550.

<sup>176</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 13,29; BA 21, 496–498.

<sup>177</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 3,5; BA 21, 442.

<sup>178</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 14,30; BA 21, 500.

time, Pelagius rejects the solution proposed by Caelestius, who maintained that grace is imparted in the free choice of the will, the law and Christian teaching, whereas only men themselves are responsible for single good deeds.<sup>179</sup> This raises the question of whether Pelagius regards as necessary the aid of the Holy Spirit in single good deeds in the same way as Augustine does. Does he also think that our actions, if good, are “ruled and directed” by God? Augustine has his doubts.<sup>180</sup>

The following statement, which Pelagius was asked to explain during the trial, also worries Augustine. It is the assertion from Caelestius’ book that God endows the worthy ones (*dignus*), e.g. the apostle Paul, with “all graces”. First of all, says Augustine, there are many graces within the church, not all of which were conferred on Paul;<sup>181</sup> but above all, as Paul himself maintains, God does not give his grace to a man who has proved himself worthy of receiving it, but it is given to those who are unworthy so that they could become worthy:

A grace, then, is given to those who are not worthy of it so that what is owed may be paid to those who are worthy of it. But God brings it about that people have that for which he is going to repay them, when they are worthy, by giving to them what they did not have, when they were unworthy.<sup>182</sup>

Not even faith is a human merit which makes one “worthy” of something, but it is a free gift, given by God according to his will. It is only by faith, given to the unworthy ones, that men can achieve the crown of righteousness, as the apostle Paul did. For he was endowed with the grace of apostleship as an unworthy one; he also says of himself, “by the grace of God I am what I am” (1 Cor. 15:9–10). Not even Paul received God’s grace for his labour, but he received it in order that he might labour in the service of God (*Gratiam non laboravit, ut acciperet, sed accepit, ut laboraret*). So how can Pelagius claim that Paul was worthy of God’s grace?<sup>183</sup>

God’s grace, Augustine continues, is not bestowed according to human merits (*secundum merita nostra dari*), as Caelestius has it. Pelagius did reject this assertion, but “worthy of receiving” (*dignum esse accipere*) and

<sup>179</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 14,30: BA 21, 498–500.

<sup>180</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 14,31: BA 21, 500–504. Concerning the difference between enabling and co-operative grace, see C. Kirwan, *Augustine*, London 1989, 106–111.

<sup>181</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 14,32: BA 21, 504–508.

<sup>182</sup> *Gratia ergo donatur indignis, ut reddatur debitum dignis; ipse autem facit, ut habeant quaecumque redditurus est dignis qui ea quae non habebant donavit indignis* (*De gest. Pel.* 14,33: BA 21, 510). English translation by R.J. Teske, 358.

<sup>183</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 14,34–36: BA 21, 510–518.

“to receive according to merit” (*secundum meritum accipere*) are the same thing. So why is it that Pelagius says that grace is given to those who are worthy?<sup>184</sup> For it is not true that God bestows his mercy according to human effort and that through repentance men become worthy of mercy, and as such it was rejected by Pelagius himself in Diospolis.<sup>185</sup>

With respect to the records from Diospolis, Augustine regards Pelagius’ idea of grace as incoherent. Either he should acknowledge the teaching attributed there to Caelestius, i.e., the teaching regarding grace only as good nature, the gift of the free choice of the will, the divine law and the forgiveness of sins through repentance<sup>186</sup> (according to Augustine’s account, this is what Pelagius himself maintained in his older book,<sup>187</sup> namely *De natura*) or he should acknowledge the “ecclesiastical” Pauline teaching, according to which grace is a freely given justification of sinners and assistance in their struggle with the “law of sin”, bestowed by God according to his will,<sup>188</sup> i.e., to those he himself predestined and “governs” (*regit*) with his Spirit.<sup>189</sup>

Through the prism of Augustine’s doctrine, there is no third possibility besides these two, as Pelagius would presumably have wanted it. Without doubt, Pelagius acted with the utmost caution and diplomacy in Diospolis, but his hesitation between the two extremes of Augustine’s disjunction may suggest more than just hypocrisy.

Pelagius explicitly did not want to deny that God’s grace aids human good deeds without removing human responsibility for evil. What he probably did want to avoid at all costs was the consequence of Augustine’s inexorable deduction leading, according to Pelagius, to the derogation of human ascetic effort: to the notion that the eternal destinies of men are not determined by the quality of their lives, but, regardless of this, were established by God, who, in a way, acts on the behalf of men even in the human effort to attain virtue. Unlike Augustine, who advocates the notion of freely chosen and rightfully reprobated men, separated only by the inscrutable will of God, Pelagius attaches the greatest importance to human deeds and human efforts to attain virtue. This also corresponds to his eschatology: Pelagius

<sup>184</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 17,40: *BA* 21, 524–526.

<sup>185</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 18,42–19,43: *BA* 21, 528–530.

<sup>186</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 35,61: *BA* 21, 564–566.

<sup>187</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 23,47: *BA* 21, 534.

<sup>188</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 6–7,20: *BA* 21, 476–478; *De gest. Pel.* 14,33: *BA* 21, 508–510.

<sup>189</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 3,7–8: *BA* 21, 448.

is convinced that God does not forgive sins on Judgement Day, but gives all men their due. Inasmuch as the spectrum of human lives defies binary classification, Pelagius introduces a middle category between those who are “worthy” of grace (such as the apostle Paul) and the sinners who deserve eternal punishment (*aeterno supplicio puniendi*), namely mild sinners who are to be saved by purgatorial fire (*per ignem salvandi*; cf. 1 Cor. 3:15). Otherwise, says Pelagius, we would have to agree with Origen that all men will be purged eventually.<sup>190</sup>

Although Augustine’s commentary on the Diospolis records does not seem to elaborate extensively on his previous doctrine on grace, it reveals a vivid picture of the whole ambivalence of his anti-Pelagian campaign. Pelagius does *not* want to reduce grace to human nature, the free choice of the will, the law and forgiveness of penitents, but he *also* trusts God’s aid in single human acts, just as Augustine does. However, he is disinclined to accept Augustine’s logic, which leads inevitably to the notion of men as beings governed by God and to double predestination. Face to face with Augustine’s dichotomies, Pelagius’ ascetically motivated teaching is thus rendered inconsistent and theologically vague.

Caelestius, Pelagius’ disciple, seems to have adopted a different attitude. Having accepted the logic of Augustine’s dichotomies, he lets himself be carried to the extremes required by its disjunctions. When men do not turn to the good, it is not due to the lack of grace, but only men themselves are to blame. Men are thus fully responsible for their decisions, and therefore also deserve credit for turning to the good. This idea seems to echo Augustine’s deduction inversely: men are not able to turn towards the good without grace, which therefore deserves credit for such a turn. God thus decides himself who will be turned towards the good.

Caelestius’ teaching, condemned in Diospolis, thus appears to be the reverse of Augustine’s doctrine, relying on the same logic of dichotomies as far as the relationship of the contributions of men and God in the human turning towards the good is concerned. Although it was probably this kind of logic which Pelagius was attempting not to accept, he was not able to present an alternative one.

---

<sup>190</sup> *De gest. Pel.* 3,9–10: BA 21, 450–452.

1.6. *Cognitive and Affective Grace*  
(*De gratia Christi et de peccato originali I*)

Augustine returns to the agenda of the synod of Diospolis once again in another of his anti-Pelagian works, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, addressed to his friends Albina, Pinianus and Melania (the Younger),<sup>191</sup> in which Pelagius' ideas are discussed in greater detail (on the basis of Augustine's further reading of his works, in particular *Pro libero arbitrio*). The two main points of departure of the work are captured in its title: what grace, aiding human good deeds, is, and whether there is original sin. The arguable statements concerning these themes, condemned in Diospolis, come from Caelestius, whereas Pelagius renounced them. However, was he sincere in his renunciation?

It has already been said that when in Diospolis, Pelagius rejected the idea that God's grace was not needed in individual good deeds of men. Does he mean by this grace (as Augustine does) the impact of the Holy Spirit on the human heart, i.e., the "pouring out of love" which gives men the power to overcome their ineradicable concupiscence? Augustine has his doubts, as we know, and finds a different answer in Pelagius' works.<sup>192</sup>

According to Pelagius, says Augustine, there are three aspects involved in a human good deed (the fulfilment of God's commandment): capacity, volition and action (*possibilitas, voluntas, actio*), but only the first can be regarded as "grace" in Pelagius' opinion; the other two are our own.<sup>193</sup> While capacity is given by the nature created by God, volition is based on the free choice of the will, and what actually happens results from this will (*posse in natura, velle in arbitrio, esse in effectu*). He thus seeks the assistance of God's grace only in human capacity as the prerequisite for volition and action.<sup>194</sup> Although he also maintains that grace precedes the free choice of the will and cannot be destroyed by the human will, what he means by "grace" is the created nature common to all men, which they cannot corrupt, however much they may use it to the wrong end. It is precisely because volition and action may be evil, says Pelagius, that men are responsible for them, while the incorruptible human nature is a work of God.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> Pinianus and his wife Melania the Younger were Roman aristocratic sympathisers of Pelagius. During their stay in Africa after the fall of Rome, Augustine did not dare to attack Pelagius directly in any of his works (see P. Brown, "The Patrons of Pelagius", 212 f., 217 f.).

<sup>192</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,2,2: BA 22, 54.

<sup>193</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,3,4: BA 22, 58.

<sup>194</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,4,5: BA 22, 60; similarly *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,16,17: BA 22, 88.

<sup>195</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,17,18: BA 22, 88–90.

In Pelagius' opinion, faith, i.e., the human turning towards God, is also an act of the human will,<sup>196</sup> rewarded by God's grace, which helps men to achieve a sinless life "more easily".<sup>197</sup> The help of the Holy Spirit in individual good deeds is allegedly limited to the forgiveness of sins, the example of Christ's life, which men keep in mind, and the Christian teaching which they ought to follow.<sup>198</sup> Thus, Pelagius holds, grace mainly assists men in their deeds by teaching them: it opens their eyes and illuminates them with a view to God's promises.<sup>199</sup> God surely does affect the human will, says Pelagius, but by teaching, persuading and exhorting.<sup>200</sup>

This notion is directly opposite to that of Augustine's as we know it from the previous anti-Pelagian works. According to Augustine, God does not only give the capacity for a good deed, but also works in men "both to will and to do" (Phil. 2:13).<sup>201</sup> Human nature as created is not a permanent capacity for both the good and evil will and the resulting deeds, but is determined by cupidity (*cupiditas*) or love (*caritas*) and is thus divided into two entirely different roots. While cupidity, as the corruption of the original human nature, is actually brought about by the will, love, as its recovery, is given by God:

In fact, love (*caritas*), the root of good actions, is one thing, and covetousness (*cupiditas*), the root of bad actions, is something else. They are as different as virtue and vice. But that ability is clearly able to become each of these roots, because human beings not only can have love by which they are good trees, but also can have covetousness by which they are bad trees. Human covetousness, which is a vice, has as its source either a human being or the deceiver of human beings, not their creator. ... But love, which is a virtue, comes to us from God, not from ourselves.<sup>202</sup>

<sup>196</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,22,24: BA 22, 98–100.

<sup>197</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,31,34: BA 22, 118–120; *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,27,28–28,29: BA 22, 110–112.

<sup>198</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,2,2: BA 22, 54–56; *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,31,33: BA 22, 116–118; *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,35,38: BA 22, 126; *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,41,45: BA 22, 136–138.

<sup>199</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,7,8: BA 22, 68.

<sup>200</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,10,11: BA 22, 74–76.

<sup>201</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,5,6: BA 22, 62–64; see also *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,47,52: BA 22, 148–150.

<sup>202</sup> ... aliud est enim caritas, radix bonorum, aliud cupiditas, radix malorum, tantumque inter se differunt quantum virtus et vitium. Sed plane illa possibilitas utriusque radicis est capax, quia non solum potest homo habere caritatem, qua sit arbor bona, sed potest etiam cupiditatem, qua sit arbor mala. Sed cupiditas hominis, quae vitium est, hominem habet auctorem vel hominis deceptorem, non hominis creatorem. ... Caritas autem, quae virtus est, ex Deo nobis est, non ex nobis ... (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,20,21–21,22: BA 22, 94–96). English translation after R.J. Teske 414. See the whole passage in *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,18,19–21,22: BA 22, 90–96.



This gift, Augustine goes on to say, is not tied to previous human acts; it is not conditioned by faith, either, but is freely given as grace and only then does it arouse faith.<sup>203</sup> God works in men not only “from without” by the law and teaching, but he operates from “within” by pouring out love or, in other words, good will, in the hearts of men:

... God produces in the hearts of human beings, not merely revelations that are true, but also wills that are good. He does this not through the law and teachings that strike our ears from outside, but by his marvelous and ineffable power that is internal and hidden.<sup>204</sup>

His assistance to human deeds is thus not only cognitive (*agere scire*): it does not only provide the knowledge of the law, Christian teaching and the example of Christ’s life. Above all, with an ineffable sweetness it infuses (*cum ineffabili suavitate infundere*) grace, which results in real action (*scire agere*). He not only exhibits truth, but likewise imparts love:

If we are to call this grace “teaching,” we should certainly mean by it the teaching which we believe God pours out with an ineffable sweetness in the depths and interior of the soul, not merely through those who externally plant and water, but also through himself who gives the increase secretly (cf. 1 Cor. 3:7). In that way he not merely reveals the truth, but also imparts love. After all, that is the way God teaches those *who have been called according to his purpose* (Rom. 8:28); at the same time he grants them both to know what they should do and to do what they know.<sup>205</sup>

The commandment thus ceases to be terrible (*terribile*) and becomes a pleasant (*suave*) one; it does not draw its authority from fear any more, but is complied with freely. Keeping a commandment “freely” means, according to Augustine, keeping it “with delight” (*Praeceptum quippe liber facit, qui libens facit*).<sup>206</sup>

<sup>203</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,23,24; BA 22, 100–102.

<sup>204</sup> ... *non lege atque doctrina insonante forinsecus, sed interna et occulta, mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum, non solum veras revelationes, sed bonas agere voluntates* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,24,25; BA 22, 104). English translation by R.J. Teske, 416f.

<sup>205</sup> *Haec gratia si doctrina dicenda est, certe sic dicatur ut altius et interius eam Deus cum ineffabili suavitate credatur infundere non solum per eos qui plantant et rigant extrinsecus, sed etiam per se ipsum, qui incrementum suum ministrat occultus, ita ut non ostendat tantummodo veritatem, verum etiam inpartiat caritatem. Sic enim docet Deus eos qui secundum propositum vocati sunt, simul donans et quid agant scire et quod sciunt agere* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,13,14; BA 22, 80). English translation by R.J. Teske, 410.

<sup>206</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,13,14; BA 22, 84.

The way God works in the human will does not predominantly consist of persuasion, exhortation, or a rational appeal. Augustine maintains that it is not in the power of the teaching to actually move a human being to action. For that to happen, the will must be affected by love, because only thus can a human being be “moved” to action (*persuadere*), not merely “urged on” (*suadere*):

But we want the Pelagians at some point to admit not merely the grace by which we are promised the great glory to come, but that by which we believe in and hope for it; not merely the grace by which wisdom is revealed, but that by which we love it as well; not merely the grace by which we are urged on toward everything good, but that which moves us to action.<sup>207</sup>

This, according to Augustine, is unique to Christianity: it is not only a matter of the knowledge of the law or the teaching, but of assistance in real deeds. However, as man is inflicted by ignorance and concupiscence, and his strength is “made perfect in weakness” (2 Cor. 12:9), it cannot be attained otherwise than by affecting his will.<sup>208</sup>

In the first book of his work, Augustine contrasts the Pelagian notion of “cognitive” grace with the conception of grace as the affective impact on the will:

This grace not only makes us know what we should do, but also makes us do what we know; it not only makes us believe what we should love, but makes us love what we believe.<sup>209</sup>

However, this doctrine has its pitfalls and it does not seem to be entirely consistent, either. Augustine himself insists, opposing Pelagius, that the struggle to attain virtue in this life is not “easy” even with the assistance of grace, but requires “labour”.<sup>210</sup> If grace really affected the will “from within” so that it wanted what was good spontaneously, the labour would presumably dissolve under the influence of the given “sweetness”. On the other hand, Augustine regards men as beings floundering around between the real

---

<sup>207</sup> *Sed nos eam gratiam volumus isti aliquando fateantur, qua futurae gloriae magnitudo non solum promittitur, verum etiam creditur et speratur, nec solum revelatur sapientia, verum et amatur, nec solum suadetur omne quod bonum est, verum et persuadetur* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,10,11: BA 22, 76). English translation by R.J. Teske, 404.

<sup>208</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,12,13: BA 22, 78–80.

<sup>209</sup> *Qua gratia agitur non solum ut facienda noverimus, verum etiam ut cognita faciamus; nec solum ut diligenda credamus, verum etiam ut credita diligamus* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,12,13: BA 22, 80). English translation by R.J. Teske, 410.

<sup>210</sup> See above, chap. III.1.5.

sweetness of grace and the false sweetness of concupiscence. That raises the question of how it is that one or the other wins. Does it matter whose affective impact is stronger, or perhaps whose sweetness seems to be “sweeter” at the moment? In other words, does God determine the victory and the loss by “measuring out” the sweet grace?

Or is it the labour itself which Augustine regards as “sweetness”? However, in order for it to be more than twisted masochism, this would have to mean that for some reason, men, because of grace, regard doing even what requires labour as “sweet”, e.g. because it is commanded or because they consider it to be right. Freedom which acts with delight (*liber facit, qui libens facit*)<sup>211</sup> would thus not mean doing what one enjoys doing, but finding delight in what one regards as right (what is commanded) although it requires labour. Undoubtedly, such a version of a free act as a pleasant one seems to be more morally acceptable, but it is far from certain whether this is what Augustine had in mind.

### 1.7. *Infants Must Bear Sin*

#### (De gratia Christi et de peccato originali II)

The other issue in Augustine’s treatise concerns two statements of Caelestius’ denying the existence of inherited sin: according to Caelestius, Adam’s sin harmed only himself, not the whole human race, and new-born infants are thus in the same state as Adam was in before his transgression.<sup>212</sup>

At the trial in Carthage, Caelestius called this theme a matter for inquiry (*quaestio*) in which one may be enlightened, but should not be accused of heresy;<sup>213</sup> he also referred to Rufinus, who (in his anti-Origen polemic) denied original sin as well.<sup>214</sup> In Caelestius’ opinion, says Augustine, it is unimaginable that the good creator might convey sin to man by nature (*tradi ... per naturam*). The reason for infant baptism, which Caelestius does not deny, is not the remission of sins (as sins are solely volitional acts, of which infants are not capable yet), but to accompany by grace what the

<sup>211</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* I,13,14: BA 22, 84.

<sup>212</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,2,2: BA 22, 160.

<sup>213</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,23,26: BA 22, 204.

<sup>214</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,3,3: BA 22, 162; cf. Rufinus, *Liber de fide* 28: Miller 90–94; *Liber de fide* 38–39: Miller 110–114. On Rufinus, see above, p. 159, n. 2. In denying inherited sin, Caelestius might have been reacting to Origenian ideas spread in Rome (such is the opinion of P. Brown, “The Patrons of Pelagius”, 219 f.).

resources of nature cannot do on their own so that men could enter the kingdom of heaven.<sup>215</sup>

In this point, Pelagius renounced Caelestius' teaching at the synod of Diospolis.<sup>216</sup> However, in what way does Pelagius' conception differ from that of his disciple, if at all? Surely, says Augustine, not in his acceptance of the "Catholic" teaching on original sin.<sup>217</sup>

Similarly to Caelestius, Pelagius maintains that men are not born with virtues or vices as these are only future acts of the will, but only with human nature in the way it was created by God.<sup>218</sup> If he does agree, nevertheless, that the sin of the first man harms the whole human race, he probably means, according to Augustine, that the transgression has a sinister influence on Adam's children as a bad example (*exemplo*). Indeed, not even Pelagius maintains that infants are born in the same state as Adam was in before his transgression because they are not born with a fully-fledged rational will (*rationalis voluntatis arbitrium*), and thus cannot understand or fulfil God's commandments.<sup>219</sup>

Although baptism is administered to children and adults in the same words, says Pelagius, its meaning is not the same as there is no remission of sins in the case of children.<sup>220</sup> What happens to infants who die unbaptised is, in Pelagius' opinion, not clear: being without sin, they cannot be punished, but they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, either, being unbaptised.<sup>221</sup> Pelagius' eschatology thus seems to require another category apart from the kingdom of heaven, eternal punishment, and passing through the purgatorial fire: a place for unbaptised infants without punishment and without full participation in the kingdom of God; in other words, a destiny which human nature deserves on its own, created as good, but not accompanied by grace.

Augustine's outlook on this teaching had already been made clear in his previous treatises. Because of its founder's transgression, the whole human race became a single "mass of perdition", from which only grace freely given in Christ can set it free:

<sup>215</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,5,5–6,6: BA 22, 166–168.

<sup>216</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,10,11–11,12: BA 22, 174–178.

<sup>217</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,16,17: BA 22, 188.

<sup>218</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,13,14: BA 22, 180.

<sup>219</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,15,16: BA 22, 186.

<sup>220</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,21,24: BA 22, 200.

<sup>221</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,21,23: BA 22, 198. On Pelagian eschatology, see B. Piault, "Autour de la controverse pélagienne. «Le troisième lieu»", in: *RechSR* 44, 1956, 481–514; F. Refoulé, "La distinction «royaume de Dieu—vie éternelle» est-elle pélagienne?", in: *RechSR* 51, 1963, 247–254.

From the day, then, that *through one man sin entered the world, and through sin death, and thus it was passed on to all human beings in whom all have sinned* (Rom. 5:12), the whole mass destined for damnation became the property of the destroyer. No one, then, no one at all, has been set free or is being set free or will be set free except by the grace of the redeemer.<sup>222</sup>

The redeemer's grace, regardless of previous merits, pours out the love of the Holy Spirit into the hearts of men as the ground of human good deeds:

For their hearts were cleansed by the same faith in the mediator, and charity was poured out in them by the Holy Spirit, who *breathes where he wills* (John 3:8). He does not act in response to our merit, but he himself causes our merit. After all, the grace of God would not be grace at all, unless it was absolutely gratuitous.<sup>223</sup>

Denying the corruption of human nature means denying the need for a physician, and consequently, breaking the rule of faith (*regula fidei*).<sup>224</sup>

Augustine can only support such a strong statement<sup>225</sup> with the custom of infant baptism (which had spread in the meantime, but was far from commonplace in the old church). Again, he applies a kind of logical deduction here: if it is customary to baptise infants and if baptism is administered for the remission of sins, then infants must bear sin. However, infants have no personal sins as they do not yet make use of their reason and will (referring to Rom. 9:11, Augustine rejects the "Platonic" idea of the sin of the soul before its incarnation). Infants thus bear inherited sin:

<sup>222</sup> *Ex quo tempore igitur per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt, profecto universa massa perditionis facta est possessio perditoris. Nemo itaque, nemo prorsus inde liberatus est aut liberatur aut liberabitur nisi gratia redemptoris* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,29,34; BA 22, 228–230). English translation by R.J. Teske, 452.

<sup>223</sup> *Et ipsorum enim corda eadem mundabantur mediatoris fide et diffundebatur in eis caritas per Spiritum sanctum, qui ubi vult spirat, non merita sequens, sed etiam ipsa merita faciens. Non enim Dei gratia gratia erit ullo modo, nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,24,28; BA 22, 212). English translation by R.J. Teske, 448.

<sup>224</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,29,34; BA 22, 228–230.

<sup>225</sup> In the conclusion of his treatise (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,41,47; BA 22, 264–266) Augustine also appeals to the authority of the saint Bishop Ambrose, who seems to accept the notion of original sin in some of his works (see *De exc. frat.* II,6: CSEL 73, 254 etc.; see also below, chap. III.3.1, nn. 43, 49 and chap. III.3.4, n. 171). It is in this work that Augustine appeals to Ambrose as a theological authority for the first time in order to substantiate the validity of his own doctrine (for more details, see E. Rebillard, "Augustin et ses autorités: l'élaboration de l'argument patristique au cours de la controverse pélagienne", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 245–263). It is worth mentioning here that it was probably Deacon Paulinus of Milan, identified with Ambrose's biographer of the same name, who was the first in Africa to accuse Caelestius of denying the doctrine of infant baptism for the remission of original sin (see E. TeSelle, *Augustine the Theologian*, London 1970, 265f.; G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research*, 37f.; idem, "Pelagianism", 40; idem, "Augustine", 31).

Why, then, is an infant rightly punished with such perdition, unless the infant belongs to that mass of perdition and, as one born of Adam, it is understood to be justly condemned because of the debt that binds it from of old, unless it is set free from it, not as something owed to it, but by grace?<sup>226</sup>

Even if this argument could hold up (which is far from obvious), it does not follow that infants deserve eternal death for inherited sin. In order to substantiate this appalling conviction, Augustine recalls the Old Testament circumcision, which was to be performed on the eighth day after birth so that the infant was not “cut off from his people” (Gen. 17:12–14). Augustine takes the view that circumcision is “a seal of the righteousness of the faith” (*signaculum iustitiae fidei*, cf. Rom. 4:11), referring to Christ, who arose from the dead on the eighth day of the week (the first day after Saturday). After they are born, all infants must be released by Christ’s grace, or they will, as members of the “mass of perdition”, be rightly condemned.<sup>227</sup>

Augustine goes on to speak about the bestial motion (*bestialis motus*) of libidinous procreation<sup>228</sup> as the moment when “the contagion of sin” (*peccati contagio*),<sup>229</sup> i.e., “the contagion of carnal generation” (*contagio carnalis generationis*)<sup>230</sup> is passed on, which, as “nature’s defect” (*naturae vitium*), is transmitted together with human nature itself:

Both of these, however, are propagated together, nature and nature’s defect; one of these is good, the other evil. The one is derived from the generosity of the creator; the other is contracted from the condemnation at the origin. The good will of the sovereign God is the cause of the one; the evil will of the first human being is the cause of the other.<sup>231</sup>

Hence, even children who are not able to sin, are not born without the contagion of sin; not from what is licit, but from what is shameful. For from what is licit a nature comes to be; from what is shameful a defect. God who created human beings and joined man and wife by the bond of marriage is

<sup>226</sup> *Unde ergo recte infans illa perditione punitur, nisi quia pertinet ad massam perditionis et iuste intellegitur ex Adam natus antiqui debiti obligatione damnatus, nisi inde fuerit, non secundum debitum, sed secundum gratiam liberatus?* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,31,36: BA 22, 234). English translation by R.J. Teske, 453. See the whole passage in *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,30,35–31,36: BA 22, 232–234.

<sup>227</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,30,35–31,36: BA 22, 232–234.

<sup>228</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,38,43: BA 22, 252–254.

<sup>229</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,37,42: BA 22, 250.

<sup>230</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,32,37: BA 22, 238.

<sup>231</sup> *Simul autem utrumque propagatur, et natura et naturae vitium, quorum est unum bonum, alterum malum. Illud de conditoris largitate sumitur, hoc de origine damnationis attrahitur; illi est causa bona voluntas Dei summi, huic mala voluntas hominis primi* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,33,38: BA 22, 240). English translation by R.J. Teske, 454.

the author of the nature that is born, but the author of the defect is the ruse of the deceitful devil and the consent of the human will.<sup>232</sup>

... [A]nd for that reason whatever in that race had not yet been born was rightly condemned in its sinful root. Birth in the flesh held human beings bound in that condemned lineage, and only spiritual rebirth set them free.<sup>233</sup>

However, not even this strange idea (referring to the immaculate birth of Christ as the only man without sin<sup>234</sup>) can explain why guilt is transmitted by procreation as well, instead of concupiscence, ignorance, and mortality alone as its consequences. Augustine's explanation concerning the inheritance of attributable guilt (*reatus*) goes simply along the lines that as a result of the concupiscence which accompanies procreation, no parents can avoid passing it on to their children:

The guilt of that defect (*reatus vitii*), of which we are speaking, will remain in the carnal offspring of those who have been born again, until it has been washed away in them by the bath of rebirth. Those who have been born again do not produce children of the flesh who have been born again, but ones that have been born. And thus they pass on to them, not the result of being born again, but of being born. Therefore, whether one is a guilty non-believer or a believer who has received forgiveness, one produces children who are guilty, not forgiven.<sup>235</sup>

Augustine's deduction would presumably be as follows: infants are born with sin, which must be remitted by baptism. Baptism does not remove the consequences of sin (concupiscence, ignorance, and mortality prevail even after baptism). Baptism thus does away with the guilt itself without removing its consequences. Therefore, being guilty, unbaptised infants will be condemned.

---

<sup>232</sup> *Hinc est quod infantes etiam, qui peccare non possunt, non tamen sine peccati contagione nascuntur, non ex hoc quod licet, sed ex eo quod dedecet. Nam ex hoc quod licet natura nascitur, ex illo quod dedecet, vitium. Naturae nascentis est auctor Deus, qui hominem condidit et qui virum ac feminam nuptiali iure coniunxit, vitii vero auctor est diaboli decipientis calliditas et hominis consentientis voluntas* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,37,42; BA 22, 250). English translation after R.J. Teske, 456.

<sup>233</sup> ... et ideo ibi quidquid etiam nondum erat natum merito est in praevericatrice radice damnatum, in qua stirpe damnata tenet hominem generatio carnalis, unde sola liberat regeneratio spiritalis (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,38,43; BA 22, 252). English translation by R.J. Teske, 457.

<sup>234</sup> *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,41,47; BA 22, 266.

<sup>235</sup> *Reatus itaque vitii eius, de quo loquimur, in regeneratorum prole carnali tamdiu manebit, donec et illic lavacro regenerationis abluitur. Regeneratus quippe non regenerat filios carnis, sed generat, ac per hoc in eos, non quod regeneratus, sed quod generatus est, traicit. Sic igitur sive reus infidelis sive absolutus fidelis non generat absolutos uterque, sed reos ...* (*De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.* II,40,45; BA 22, 256). English translation by R.J. Teske, 458.

\*\*\*

In his polemic against Pelagius and Caelestius, Augustine elaborated on his doctrine on the relationship between God's grace and the freedom of the will from his answer to Simplicianus (I.2). He especially developed the notion of God's impact on the will as an affective influence of grace from within. This impact, on one hand, does not deprive human deeds of their volitional nature, but, on the other hand, places the ultimate responsibility for good deeds in the hands of God himself. He decides whose will he is going to persuade in such a way as to succeed, and whom he is going to leave to their deserved perdition.

The general perdition of the human race is, according to Augustine, caused by the solidarity of all people with the founder of the race, in whose sin all people participated and therefore deserve to be punished. This solidarity is manifested in the transmission of life through procreation, in which—as a result of its libidinous nature, in itself a punishment for sin—the very illness of human nature is passed on: mortality, ignorance, concupiscence, and, on top of that, also the burden of Adam's guilt, for which each man may be justly punished from the moment he is born.

Although this guilt is removed by the conferral of baptism for the remission of sins, the consequences of sin, i.e., mortality, ignorance, and concupiscence, prevail and recover only slowly in the struggle of a virtuous life which a human being can maintain when assisted by grace. "From within" his heart, grace enables him to find delight in what is right and thus overcome concupiscence; however, in the mortal body it cannot be eradicated entirely (just as it is not possible to overcome physical death, another consequence of sin).

This teaching rests on two premises: Augustine's assertion that if human nature were healthy, it would not need a physician and Christ would have come in vain, and on the practice of infant baptism, which, according to Augustine, would be groundless if infants were without sin. The practice of infant baptism, inasmuch as it does not remove the consequences of sin but only guilt, proves that infants also bear the guilt of inherited sin and, if they die unbaptised, they are condemned eternally.

At the same time, as the development of Augustine's doctrine on grace shows (but is it still a doctrine on grace?), the whole confusing argument concerning infant baptism, original sin, and libidinous procreation did not play the decisive role in his reflections, but was rather a supporting one. What seems to be crucial is his idea of the double predestination of men as the reverse of his teaching of freely given grace. For grace to be given freely,



God alone decides, in a way which is incomprehensible to men, who will be endowed with it. To such men God gives faith and good will so that they could will their salvation and would be able to actually attain it with their good deeds. If a pardon is to be given to the chosen ones entirely freely and, on the other hand, if the perdition of the reprobated ones is to be just, all men must deserve eternal punishment. All men, irrespective of their age, are thus guilty.<sup>236</sup>

As his letter to the priest Sixtus,<sup>237</sup> written in 418, shows, Augustine did not abandon this idea as it first appeared in the answer to Simplicianus (I.2) twenty years earlier, but, on the contrary, supplemented it by his doctrine of God's affective impact on the human will, original sin, and libidinous procreation, which he had elaborated on in the meantime. Reading this letter, in which Augustine, among others, returns to the destiny of the twin brothers Esau and Jacob, one may feel that his reflection, which started with his answer to Simplicianus, has come full circle. It is as if the spiral of his thinking has reached the same point, but on a more elaborate—and more appalling—level:

*Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated* (Mal. 1:2–3; Rom. 9:13). The blessed Apostle quotes this testimony of a Prophet who came long after both brothers to give us to understand plainly by the latter utterance what was hidden in the predestination of God by grace (*praedestinatio per gratiam*) before they were born. For what did He love but the free gift of His mercy (*gratuitum misericordiae donum*) in Jacob before Jacob was born and could do something good? And what did He hate but original sin (*originale peccatum*) in Esau before Esau was born and could do something evil?<sup>238</sup>

A deserved penalty (*debita poena*) is meted out to the damned (*damnatus*), an undeserved grace (*indebita gratia*) to the saved, so that the former cannot complain that he is undeserving nor the latter boast that he is deserving. Where one and the same clay of damnation and offense (*massa damnationis et offensionis*) is involved, there can be no respect had of persons, so that the saved may learn from the lost that the same punishment would have been his lot, also, if grace had not rescued him; if it is grace, it is obviously not awarded for any merit, but bestowed as a pure act of bounty (*gratuita bonitate*). ... For, when the whole lump of clay is justly doomed to destruction (*merito damnata*), justice awards it the dishonor it deserves, while grace bestows an

---

<sup>236</sup> As W. Simonis puts it, Augustine's doctrine on grace is a "negative Gnadentheologie", as it were, because it needs to be substantiated by the sin of the whole of humankind; see W. Simonis, "Anliegen und Grundgedanke der Gnadenlehre Augustins", in: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*, 34, 1983, 1–21, 19f.

<sup>237</sup> Ep. 194: CSEL 57, 176–214.

<sup>238</sup> Ep. 194,8,34: CSEL 57, 203. English translation after W. Parsons, 324.

undeserved honor, not for any privilege of merit (*non meriti praerogativa*), not through any inevitability of fate (*fati necessitate*), not through any chance stroke of fortune (*temeritate fortunae*), but through *the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God* (Rom. 11:33), which the Apostle does not reveal to us, but marvels at as something hidden, crying out: *O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, how unsearchable his ways!* (Rom. 11:33–34)<sup>239</sup>

For all the impression of the whole theme culminating here and now, in 418, the most dramatic period of Augustine's polemic is yet to come. In 419, the first work of his toughest opponent, Julian of Eclanum, will appear. Becoming more and more fierce, the dispute will preoccupy Augustine until the end of his life, i.e., for more than ten years.

---

<sup>239</sup> *Ep.* 194,2,4–5: CSEL 57, 178–180. English translation by W. Parsons, 303f.



## CHAPTER TWO

### OTHER WORKS FROM THE PERIOD 411–430

Before we focus on the extensive dispute between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum, which represents the monumental finale of Augustine's troubled life, we will have a look at his other works from between 411 and 430. These include works varying in their subject matter and length; they are not a direct part of Augustine's anti-Pelagian campaign, but they may help provide a more rounded picture of his doctrine of grace.

The singular question which had occupied Augustine from his youth and which he decided to leave without a satisfactory solution is concerned with the origin of individual souls; it played a role in the Pelagian dispute and was the point of departure of the comprehensive work *De anima et eius origine* (1). Using an entirely different perspective from that in the agenda of the Pelagian controversy, Augustine dealt with the doctrine of grace in two quite extensive letters of spiritual purport (*De videndo Deo*; *De praesentia Dei*), which provide a valuable insight into the direction Augustine's doctrine on grace might have taken had it not been formulated in a polemical manner (2). Similarly, only an indirect anti-Pelagian tone can be found in his letter of biblical purport *De gratia Novi Testamenti* (3), whereas there are a few traces of the anti-Pelagian polemic in his sermons on Rom. 7:5–8:17 (4) and in the speculative work *De Trinitate*, finished after 411 (5). On the contrary, grace in the anti-Pelagian vein is fully present in Augustine's sermons on the Gospel of John and the Psalms, which fall into this period (6 and 7). As for Augustine's other works of predominantly spiritual purport, they, too, are concerned with the relationship between God's grace and the human will in terms of ascetical or moral engagement; these works manifest a gradual radicalisation of Augustine's thinking (8). Augustine's monumental work *De civitate Dei* builds on the duality of grace and condemnation as well (9). A separate group is comprised of Augustine's late correspondence with the monks of Hadrumetum and southern Gaul, who feared that grace which determines human destinies, as depicted in Augustine's theology, might challenge the role of human ascetical efforts. These four short treatises from the very end of Augustine's life will be discussed in the final part of this chapter (10).

2.1. *The Origin of Individual Souls*

(De Genesi ad litteram X, Ep. 166 and 190, De anima et eius origine)

It was in the third book of *De libero arbitrio*, written in the period of his presbyterate, that Augustine raised the question of how God actually creates individual souls. He proposed four possible answers without taking a decisive stand: (i) all souls are derived from the first soul; (ii) God creates the soul specially in the case of each individual, partially adjusting it to the parents' situation; (iii) God creates the souls specially, sending them into the bodies with a hereditary input of their parents; (iv) God only creates the souls, while they enter the bodies marked by the hereditary input of their own accord.<sup>1</sup> (These four possibilities, with a minor alteration, are also mentioned in Augustine's letter to Marcellinus, accompanying his first anti-Pelagian work, *De peccatorum meritis* from 412.<sup>2</sup>)

Given the fact that in some of his early works Augustine subscribed to the belief of Plotinus that the body, being low, cannot affect the soul,<sup>3</sup> it was always difficult for him to choose the third or the fourth option, as they both actually suppose that the soul is "infected" by the inherited burden of the human race dwelling in the body. Moreover, the third option is dangerously close to the Manichaean notion which Augustine himself argued against: why would a righteous and omnipotent God send guiltless souls into the misery of the body?<sup>4</sup> Nor does he send them there "as a punishment" (as the Platonists have it), because that contradicts Paul's statement that unborn men cannot have done any good or evil (see Rom. 9:11). This argument, at which Augustine presumably arrived through his expositions of Romans 9, seems to challenge the fourth option as well. The second option in its original form does not appear in Augustine's thoughts any more, perhaps because in the light of his later doctrine of inherited guilt it would imply that God himself implants into the newborn souls guilt corresponding to

<sup>1</sup> See *De lib. arb.* III,20,56,188—III,20,58,199; *CCL* 29, 307–309. See above, chap. 1.3.1 incl. n. 31. On Augustine's discussions of the human soul's origin, see G. O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind*, London 1987, 15–20.

<sup>2</sup> "... whether all souls are generated (*propagantur*) from the first one, or whether they come into existence individually in each person (*singillatim in singulis fiunt*), or whether they are created outside (*extra*) and introduced afterward, or whether they are plunged into bodies spontaneously (*sponte mergantur*) ..." (*Ep.* 143,6; *CSEL* 44, 255). English translation by W. Parsons, 154.

<sup>3</sup> See *De mus.* VI,5,8–10; *BA* 7, 376–382; similarly also Plotinus, *Enn.* III,6(26),1–5; I,1(53),2, 5–11; 5,3; Porphyry, *Sent.* 18; Lamberz 8f.

<sup>4</sup> See above, chap. 1.3.1.

the parents' guilt, which seems unacceptable. Augustine went on to modify this second option and simply maintained that the individual souls are specially created, not derived from the souls of the parents.<sup>5</sup> However, he never clearly settled for the first option either, presumably because he was concerned about its "Tertullianist", i.e., Stoic vein, which might evoke the notion of the soul as something material.<sup>6</sup> In the ensuing polemic of Julian of Eclanum, this option will even be regarded as Manichaeism.<sup>7</sup>

It has already been said that in his first anti-Pelagian work from 412, in which Augustine advocates the notion of inherited guilt against the "creationism" of his opponents (who maintain that souls are specially created and thus cannot be bound by guilt),<sup>8</sup> he does not clearly subscribe to the "traducianist" solution (according to which souls are created from the parents' souls and hereditary guilt is thus transmitted to them), but mentions as a second possibility that souls are specially created, but when they are "mingled with" the sinful flesh, the guilt of the human race is transmitted to them.<sup>9</sup> This solution, however, is very close to the third option from the introductory list. It seems that under the influence of the doctrine of inherited guilt Augustine started to doubt Plotinus' notion of unaffected souls, which he espoused in his youth (rather than—at least in this point—getting involved with Manichaeism, from which he strictly dissociated himself).

As for the traducianist solution, Augustine seems to come closest to it in the tenth book of *De Genesi ad litteram*. The question of the creation of individual souls appears here in connection with the creation of woman from Adam's side: in Scripture (Gen. 2:21–23) it is not stated clearly whether the soul of the first woman was created from Adam together with her

<sup>5</sup> See above, chap. III.1.1 incl. n. 59.

<sup>6</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,25,41: BA 49, 220. Arguments in favour of the corporeal soul based on philosophical and scriptural evidence are given by Tertullian, *De anima* 5,1–8,5 (ed. J.H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1947, 6–10; commentary *ibid.*, 125–162); the traducianist notion of a simultaneous beginning of the individual soul and body is elaborated on by Tertullian in *De anima* 27 (Waszink 38f.; commentary *ibid.*, 342–348). On Tertullian's notion of the soul, see H. Karpp, *Probleme altchristlicher Anthropologie. Biblische Anthropologie und philosophische Psychologie bei den Kirchenvätern des dritten Jahrhunderts*, Gütersloh 1950, 41–91; on his traducianism, see also P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milano 1978, 260–278.

<sup>7</sup> See below, chap. III.3.4 incl. n. 142. The positions of both opponents concerning the issue of the origin of the soul (and their weaknesses) are presented by M. Lambergits, "Julian and Augustine on the Origin of the Soul", in: *Augustiniana*, 46, 1996, 243–260.

<sup>8</sup> See above, chap. III.1.1 incl. n. 59.

<sup>9</sup> *De pecc. mer.* II,36,59: CSEL 60, 127 f. See above, chap. III.1.1 incl. n. 59.

body.<sup>10</sup> Augustine's theory of creation, presupposing the constitution of all things in their seminal reasons (*rationes seminales*), which are gradually realised in time,<sup>11</sup> also raises the question of whether human souls share one *ratio* which recurs in individual souls. Augustine is therefore dealing with three possibilities here: (i) the soul was originally created in its *ratio* (in the angelic mind perhaps?), and the individual souls are created from this rudiment; (ii) originally, one soul was created (Adam's soul), and other souls are propagated from it; (iii) the souls neither share one *ratio* created at the beginning nor are propagated from the first soul, but are specially created in the case of each individual (God breathes and thus creates all souls in the way he created Adam's, cf. Gen. 2:7).<sup>12</sup>

According to Augustine's exposition of both biblical cosmogonic accounts (Gen. 1–2), the creation of all things in their seminal reasons ended on the seventh day of cosmic rest (Gen. 2:2); henceforward, God no longer creates from nothing, but from seminal reasons.<sup>13</sup> This argument seems to rule out the third option presented above; nor does the first possibility (the soul created in its *ratio* in the angelic nature) seem plausible to Augustine. However, he has to deal with the fact that man, as the "image of God" (which undoubtedly refers to the soul), and, at the same time, as "male and female" (a difference which applies to the body) was created during the six days of cosmogenesis (cf. Gen. 1:26–27) and only "then" (*postea*) did God form Adam of the dust of the ground and the first woman from his rib (cf. Gen. 2:7.22). Does it mean that during the six-day cosmogenesis only the human soul was created, while the body was created just in its seminal *ratio* hidden in the material world? According to Augustine, this option seems to be the easiest to reconcile with the scriptural texts (otherwise it would follow that man was created entirely within the six days, or was not created in the six days at all, or only his body was created in its seminal reason in the material world, or the soul had its *ratio* in the spiritual nature of the angels or even in a different nature—an independently existing *ratio* of the human soul is not an option for Augustine).<sup>14</sup> Augustine thus seems to be inclined to accept the notion that the human soul was created in six days and that God created other souls from it later (including the soul of the woman).

<sup>10</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,1,1–2: BA 49, 146–148.

<sup>11</sup> See above, chap. II.3.4 incl. n. 129.

<sup>12</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,3,4: BA 49, 154.

<sup>13</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,4,7: BA 49, 158.

<sup>14</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,2,3: BA 49, 150–152.

Augustine regards—somewhat surprisingly—the practice of infant baptism,<sup>15</sup> which he interprets through the prism of the doctrine on original sin, as the strongest argument in this issue. In his opinion, this practice reveals that even newborn infants are bound by inherited sin.<sup>16</sup> However, the sin does not afflict the body only, and baptism does not aid the body, but the soul, whose eternal destiny is endangered by sin.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, concupiscence as the consequence of sin has seized both the body and soul.<sup>18</sup> If the soul was afflicted with sin at the moment of birth, it must have either been created from the souls of the parents<sup>19</sup> or “infected” (*contagio peccati*) by the body afflicted with sin immediately after their mingling.<sup>20</sup>

The latter two solutions had already appeared in Augustine’s first anti-Pelagian work, but here they also include reflections on the soul of Christ. His human body was born from his mother’s body; thus, according to Augustine, it was propagated from a body bound by original sin, but not through concupiscence, and was therefore not afflicted with sin.<sup>21</sup> Now, this raises a question: Was the human soul of Christ created from the soul of his mother as well, which would mean that it was created through all preceding generations from Adam’s soul? This halts Augustine finally; he goes on to say that Christ’s soul was propagated “from where Adam did” (*unde Adam*) rather than “from Adam” (*de Adam*).<sup>22</sup> Or are we supposed to assume, says Augustine, that the soul is propagated by “the father’s seed” as a rudiment of the soul, which—given the fact that Christ was born from a virgin—means that his soul must have been created in a different way than other souls?<sup>23</sup> Or are we to assume that Christ’s soul was propagated from Adam’s soul, yet without inherited guilt? Augustine admits he does not know the solution of this difficult question, which also casts doubt on the origin of other souls.<sup>24</sup>

Augustine’s hesitation is also manifested in his letter to Jerome (dated to 415), in which Augustine asks the distinguished scholar about his view of the problem, as he himself is not able to give a clear answer to his friend Orosius,

<sup>15</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,23,39: BA 49, 214.

<sup>16</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,14,25: BA 49, 188.

<sup>17</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,11,19: BA 49, 176–178.

<sup>18</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,12,20–21: BA 49, 178–180.

<sup>19</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,15,26: BA 49, 190.

<sup>20</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,16,28: BA 49, 192.

<sup>21</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,18,32: BA 49, 200–202.

<sup>22</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,18,33: BA 49, 202.

<sup>23</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,20,36: BA 49, 210.

<sup>24</sup> See *De Gen. litt.* X,21,37: BA 49, 212.



who is troubled by the whole matter.<sup>25</sup> Given the fact that Augustine regards Jerome as an authority on the doctrine on original sin, he formulates the issue directly as a question concerning the way in which individual souls contract the guilt (*reatus*) which renders even newborn infants guilty and worthy of eternal condemnation:

I ask when the soul contracted the guilt through which it is doomed to condemnation, even in the case of an infant, prematurely dead, on whom the grace of Christ was not conferred through the sacrament by which even babies are baptized. You are not one of those who have begun to babble new doctrines, saying that there is no guilt inherited from Adam, which has to be remitted in the infant by baptism.<sup>26</sup>

Augustine again recalls the four options given in *De libero arbitrio* III (modified according to the letter to Marcellinus, i.e., the second solution leaves out the idea that God adjusts the children's soul to their parents' level),<sup>27</sup> although he is aware that in this work he did not put sufficient emphasis on inherited guilt.<sup>28</sup>

If individual souls are specially created for each individual, where do they commit sin so that they are guilty immediately after their birth?<sup>29</sup> Moreover, if God does not create from nothing after his sabbatical rest, individual souls must have been created from things that already existed.<sup>30</sup> It seems obvious to Augustine that the souls of infants are guilty, because they have to endure various sufferings from the moment they are born. This must have some cause for which they are rightly punished, says Augustine.<sup>31</sup>

Nor does it seem more acceptable to argue that the souls are sinless and as such they enter the body afflicted with sin; in such a case, infant baptism would only be necessary for the resurrection of the body, not for the salvation of the soul. For one thing, baptism is meant for the salvation of the soul, not the body. For another, it would also be possible to baptise a body from which the soul has already departed, which is absurd.<sup>32</sup> And

<sup>25</sup> See *Ep.* 166,1,2: *CSEL* 44, 547.

<sup>26</sup> *Quaero, ubi contraxerit anima reatum, quo trahitur in condemnationem etiam infantis morte praeventi, si ei per sacramentum, quo etiam parvuli baptizantur, Christi gratia non subvenerit. Non enim es ex illis, qui modo nova quaedam garrere coeperunt dicentes nullum reatum esse ex Adam tractum, qui per baptismum in infante solvatur* (*Ep.* 166,3,6: *CSEL* 44, 554). English translation by W. Parsons, 11f.

<sup>27</sup> See *Ep.* 166,3,7: *CSEL* 44, 555f.

<sup>28</sup> See *Ep.* 166,7,18–20: *CSEL* 44, 571–575.

<sup>29</sup> See *Ep.* 166,4,10: *CSEL* 44, 560.

<sup>30</sup> See *Ep.* 166,5,11: *CSEL* 44, 561f.

<sup>31</sup> See *Ep.* 166,6,16: *CSEL* 44, 568f.

<sup>32</sup> See *Ep.* 166,8,22–24: *CSEL* 44, 577–580.

yet, if a newly created soul is sent by God himself into the body, why is it immediately worthy of condemnation? Did it commit sin before its incarnation? That, however, contradicts the teaching of the apostle, who said that unborn men have no merits (Rom. 9:11) and that it was through Adam that sin spread to all men (Rom. 5:12).<sup>33</sup>

This seems to refute the second, third, and fourth options from the original list in *De libero arbitrio*. In spite of that, Augustine does not clearly subscribe to the last—traducianist—option; on the contrary, he implies that he is inclined to adopt the creationist doctrine, but does not know how to support it when face to face with the above-mentioned difficulties.<sup>34</sup> From Jerome's previous account Augustine learnt of his creationist position<sup>35</sup> and wanted to find out how it might be reconciled with the notion of inherited guilt. Unfortunately, Jerome (who perhaps was not quite certain himself, either) never found the time to reply to Augustine.<sup>36</sup>

Augustine thus gradually came to terms with the idea that it is not possible to decide between the traducianist option and the creationist one. (As he put it in his next letter to Jerome, a man who fell into a well should be helped rather than asked how he had got there; by the same token, it is important that newborn infants should be baptised, even though we may never learn of the origin of their guilt.<sup>37</sup>)

Even traducianism has serious drawbacks, according to Augustine; above all, it cannot explain in a convincing manner how it is that the incorporeal soul is propagated from the incorporeal souls of the parents: does the "incorporeal seed of the soul" (*incorporeum semen animae*) accompany in a mysterious way the corporeal seed entering the mother's body, or is it even contained in this seed?

<sup>33</sup> See *Ep.* 166,9,27: *CSEL* 44, 582f.

<sup>34</sup> See *Ep.* 166,8,26: *CSEL* 44, 581f.

<sup>35</sup> See *Ep.* 190,6,20: *CSEL* 57, 155f. Augustine is presumably referring here to Jerome's polemics *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*, 22: *PL* 23, 372b–373a; *Apologia adversus libros Rufini*, III,28: *PL* 23, 478c–d (see E. TeSelle, "Rufinus", 67f.), and perhaps also to his letter to Marcellinus and Anapsychia (in Augustine's letters, *Ep.* 165,1,1: *CSEL* 44, 542f.), where, however, it is only stated that it would be erroneous to believe in the pre-existence and fall of the souls into the bodies (as Pythagoras, the Platonists, and Origen did) or in the emanation of the soul from the divine substance (as the Stoics, Mani, and the Priscillianists had it). Apart from the idea that the soul is born *ex traduce*, maintained by the majority of Western theologians (Tertullian, Apollinaris), Jerome also mentions the idea that God keeps creating and sending new souls into bodies, but does not indicate any special preference for it. He only refers to his polemic against Rufinus, where he allegedly expressed his view on the matter, and suggests to his correspondents that they should consult Augustine.

<sup>36</sup> See *Retract.* II,45: *CCL* 57, 126f.

<sup>37</sup> See *Ep.* 167,1,2: *CSEL* 44, 587f.

But when anyone begins to consider and examine into what is here said, it is a wonder that any human perception can understand in what manner a soul is produced or propagated (*fiat ... vel traducatur*) in the offspring from the soul of the parent, as light is kindled from light, and a second flame comes into existence without loss to the first; whether the incorporeal seed of the soul flows up by its own secret and invisible way from the father to the mother when conception takes place in a woman, or, which is still harder to believe, whether it is latent in the bodily seed.<sup>38</sup>

These difficult questions, especially concerning the corporeal seed which is wasted, are raised in Augustine's letter to Bishop Optatus (dated to 418).<sup>39</sup>

Augustine came back to the whole matter in greater detail in the four books of *De anima et eius origine*<sup>40</sup> in 419, after a monk named Renatus sent him a reaction to the above-mentioned letter to Optatus written by Vincentius Victor, a young layman (and a former Rogatian).<sup>41</sup> Arguing in favour of the creationist solution, Vincentius came dangerously close to the Pelagian position. Having first addressed Renatus (in the first book) and a presbyter named Peter (in the second book), who was allegedly captivated by Vincentius' solution, Augustine goes on to reply to Vincentius himself (in the third and fourth books). His argumentation is parallel in all his statements, and it is not because of the employment of new material that the work is so voluminous. On the contrary, Augustine's position could be summarised in one sentence: biblical accounts do not make it possible to decide between the traducianist and creationist solutions (the souls are either created *ex traduce*, or *ex nihilo*), but it is beyond doubt that no other solution is valid.<sup>42</sup>

Vincentius seems to have built his ideas on the soul on several inconsistencies: for example, he maintained that God did not create the soul from nothing, but from himself, i.e., he made it out of his breath (although, at the

---

<sup>38</sup> ... *sed cum considerari et pertractari coeperit, quid dicatur, mirum, si ullus sensus comprehendit humanus, quonam modo, tamquam lucerna de lucerna accendatur et sine detrimento alterius alter inde ignis existat, sic anima de anima parentis fiat in prole vel traducatur in prolem, utrum incorporeum semen animae sua quadam occulta et invisibili via seorsum ex patre currat in matrem, cum fit conceptus in femina, an, quod est incredibilius, in semine corporis lateat* (*Ep.* 190,4,15: CSEL 57, 149f.). English translation after W. Parsons, 279f.

<sup>39</sup> See *Ep.* 190,4,15: CSEL 57, 149f.

<sup>40</sup> In CSEL 60, the work is published as *De natura et origine animae*; Augustine himself calls the treatise *De anima et eius origine* (*Retract.* II,56: CCL 57, 135).

<sup>41</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,1,1–2,2: CSEL 60, 303f. On the Rogatians, a group separated from the Donatists, see above, chap. II.4.4 incl. n. 86.

<sup>42</sup> *Unum est enim e duobus: si ex traduce non est, ex nihilo est* (*De an. et or.* I,15,24: CSEL 60, 323).

same time, the soul is not a part of God); he also said that the soul is corporeal, extends in the body and acquires form from it (although God, from whom it was created, is not, according to Vincentius, corporeal).<sup>43</sup> Apart from that, he also held that the soul had “merited to become sinful”,<sup>44</sup> i.e., deserved to be sent into sinful flesh, and that is why a newborn infant must be baptised.<sup>45</sup> If some infants die unbaptised, says Vincentius, they will not necessarily be denied entry into paradise or even the kingdom of God<sup>46</sup> (a view which, according to Augustine, is dangerously close to the Pelagian eschatology<sup>47</sup>); on the other hand, he also explains the absence of baptism in the case of infants who die early along the lines that God presumably foreknew their future sins and punished them with death.<sup>48</sup>

Augustine finds several errors in the creationist doctrines of Vincentius. (i) How could a newly created soul deserve to “become sinful”?<sup>49</sup> Was it made sinful by God, who sent it into the body?<sup>50</sup> (ii) Newborn infants are tied in the bonds of original sin, from which they cannot be absolved in any other way than by baptism.<sup>51</sup> Vincentius actually denies original sin, for example by challenging the condemnation of unbaptised infants.<sup>52</sup> (iii) The idea that the soul had sinned previous to its participation in the flesh (“merited to become sinful”) contradicts what the apostle stated in Rom. 9:11.<sup>53</sup> (iv) If God “foreknew” sins which in fact would not be committed, and even punished

<sup>43</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,4,4–5,5: CSEL 60, 305f.; *De an. et or.* II,3,5: CSEL 60, 338f.; *De an. et or.* III,3,3: CSEL 60, 362f.; *De an. et or.* IV,18,28: CSEL 60, 407f. Augustine also mentions the more consistent doctrine of Tertullian (which he regards as entirely fallacious), according to whom both the soul and God are corporeal (*De an. et or.* II,5,9: CSEL 60, 342f.). It seems very probable, nevertheless, that Tertullian was a very important source of the ideas of Vincentius (see A.C. de Veer, “Aux origines du *De natura et origine animae* de saint Augustin”, in: *REAug* 50, 2004, 146f., 153f.).

<sup>44</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,8,9: CSEL 60, 309f.

<sup>45</sup> *De an. et or.* II,9,13: CSEL 60, 346f.

<sup>46</sup> See *De an. et or.* II,10,14: CSEL 60, 348; *De an. et or.* I,9,10: CSEL 60, 310. Another passage seems to suggest, however, that Vincentius maintained that unbaptised infants might enter the kingdom of God, though probably not immediately after their death, but after resurrection (*De an. et or.* III,13,19: CSEL 60, 374).

<sup>47</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,9,11: CSEL 60, 312.

<sup>48</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,12,15: CSEL 60, 314f.

<sup>49</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,6,6: CSEL 60, 307.

<sup>50</sup> See *De an. et or.* II,13,18: CSEL 60, 353.

<sup>51</sup> See *De an. et or.* II,12,17: CSEL 60, 351; *De an. et or.* III,9,12: CSEL 60, 369.

<sup>52</sup> *De an. et or.* III,13,19: CSEL 60, 374f.

<sup>53</sup> Augustine rejects the idea as a teaching of “ancient heretics” (disciples of Origen) and, more recently, Priscillianists (see *De an. et or.* III,7,9: CSEL 60, 367).

them, his foreknowledge would be nullified (as what he foreknows is what is to happen) and it would be unrighteous as well to punish sins that were not committed.<sup>54</sup>

The position maintained by Vincentius—creationism—need not be erroneous in itself; however, it is, according to Augustine, doubtful (*ambigua*)<sup>55</sup> and cannot be supported with scriptural arguments. The evidence presented by Vincentius merely proves, says Augustine, that the body and soul of each man are of God (see e.g. Zech. 12:1: *qui fingit spiritum hominis in ipso*): this is not doubtful, but it remains unresolved whether God creates the souls of men from the souls of their ancestors by propagation (*ex propagine*), just as he creates bodies from other bodies, or whether he creates the souls separately for each individual.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, the biblical evidence employed by Vincentius (e.g. Isa. 42:5: *qui dat flatum populo*) often does not seem to speak of the creation of the human spirit, but rather of the gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>57</sup>

Augustine comes to the conclusion that Scripture (or any other source) does not enable one to decide between traducianism and creationism, although one of them is undoubtedly valid. Perhaps men need not—or even are not meant to—know the answer in this life:

I am, nonetheless, more inclined to defend the correctness of God in not wanting us to know this, as is the case with so many other things, than rashly to make some statement. For, either such a statement would be so obscure that not only would I be unable to bring others to understand it, but I would also be unable to understand it myself ...<sup>58</sup>

After all, if this belongs among those higher questions which we are forbidden to search out and investigate (cf. Ecclus. 3:22), we should be afraid of sinning, not because we do not know it, but because we are searching for it.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> *De an. et or.* I,12,15: CSEL 60, 314 ff.; *De an. et or.* III,10,13: CSEL 60, 370. The summary of all four of Vincentius' errors in *De an. et or.* III,15,22: CSEL 60, 377 f.

<sup>55</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,14,17: CSEL 60, 317.

<sup>56</sup> *Cum ergo et spiritum hominis in ipso fingat, quaerendum est, utrum nova insufflatione an tractum ex propagine* (*De an. et or.* I,14,22: CSEL 60, 322). See also *De an. et or.* I,14,17: CSEL 60, 317 f.; *De an. et or.* I,16,26–27: CSEL 60, 325 f.

<sup>57</sup> See *De an. et or.* I,14,18–21: CSEL 60, 318–322.

<sup>58</sup> ... *paratior sum defendere quam recte etiam hoc Deus sicut alia multa nos scire noluerit quam temere dicere, quod aut ita sit obscurum, ut hoc non solum ad aliorum intelligentiam perducere nequeam, sed nec ipse intellegam* (*De an. et or.* IV,11,16: CSEL 60, 395). English translation by R.J. Teske, 543.

<sup>59</sup> *Si enim ex illis est altioribus, quae inquirere scrutarique prohibemur, timendum est, ne hoc non ignorando, sed quaerendo peccemus* (*De an. et or.* IV,4,5: CSEL 60, 385). English translation by R.J. Teske, 536.

One should rather imitate the mother of the Maccabees, who “knew that she had conceived her sons from her husband and that both their bodies and their souls and spirits were created by the creator of all things. Nonetheless, she said, *I do not know how you came to be in my womb* (cf. 2 Macc. 7:22)”!<sup>60</sup>

The important thing, says Augustine, is that the sin of the first man is transmitted to all men, for which all men are justly condemned if they are not predestined to life, i.e., if they are punished and “predestined to eternal death” (*praedestinavit ad aeternam mortem*):

As a result of one man all human beings who are born from Adam face damnation (cf. Rom. 5:18), unless they are reborn in Christ, as he determined that they be reborn, before they die in their body. To those whom he predestined to eternal life (*quos praedestinavit ad aeternam vitam*), he most mercifully gives grace, and to those whom he predestined to eternal death (*quos praedestinavit ad aeternam mortem*), he most righteously assigns punishment, not only on account of sins which they willingly add, but also on account of original sin, if infants add nothing. On this question this is my position; the result is that God’s hidden works retain their secrecy, and my faith remains intact.<sup>61</sup>

It is not that Augustine’s polemic against Vincentius on the origin of the soul is of much interest in itself: from Augustine’s account, Vincentius’ exposition (now lost) gives a somewhat chaotic impression (he may have drawn on Origenism or Priscillianism, which were widespread in Vincentius’ homeland, Spain<sup>62</sup>) and its refutation does not bring much new.<sup>63</sup> What is more remarkable is the fact that Augustine, who is entirely preoccupied with vindicating the “transmission” of guilt, not with explaining the origin of individual souls,<sup>64</sup> does not openly subscribe to the traducianist position, which would logically fit in with his thinking. Was it due to his regard for

<sup>60</sup> ... *imitaretur Machabaeorum matrem! Quae cum sciret de viro se filios concepisse et a creatore omnium sive secundum corpus sive secundum animam et spiritum sibi creatos esse, ait tamen: Nescio quomodo paruiſtis in ventrem meum* (*De an. et or.* 1,15,25: CSEL 60, 323 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 486. See also *De an. et or.* IV,4,5: CSEL 60, 384 f.

<sup>61</sup> ... *ex uno homine omnes homines ire in condemnationem qui nascuntur ex Adam, nisi ita renascantur in Christo, sicut instituit ut renascantur, antequam corpore moriantur, quos praedestinavit ad aeternam vitam misericordissimus gratiae largitor, qui est et illis quos praedestinavit ad aeternam mortem iustissimus supplicii retributor non solum propter illa quae volentes adiciunt, verum etiam, si infantes nihil adiciant, propter originale peccatum. Haec est in hac quaestione definitio mea, ut occulta opera Dei habeant suum secretum salva fide mea* (*De an. et or.* IV,11,16: CSEL 60, 396). English translation by R.J. Teske, 544.

<sup>62</sup> See A.C. de Veer, “Aux origines du *De natura et origine animae*”, 124, 156.

<sup>63</sup> In his *Retractiones* (II,56: CCL 57, 135) Augustine says that Vincentius was persuaded by his polemic.

<sup>64</sup> The same motivation of Augustine’s interest is also manifested in his letter to Optatus pursuing the same issue, *Ep.* 190,1,3: CSEL 57, 139 f. *et passim*.

an authority favouring creationism, perhaps Jerome, a most learned man (*studiosissimus*)?<sup>65</sup> Or was he concerned that traducianism might result in Tertullianism, i.e., the notion of the corporeal soul,<sup>66</sup> or even come close to Manichaeism?<sup>67</sup>

2.2. *The Grace of Seeing God and the Grace of God's Presence in Man*  
(*De videndo Deo, De praesentia Dei*)

The agenda of the Pelagian controversy not only influenced Augustine's doctrine on the soul, but together with his doctrine of grace determined his conception of Christian spirituality.<sup>68</sup> Somewhat exceptional are two quite extensive letters based on the questions of his correspondents, in which Augustine focuses on spirituality and grace from a different perspective than that concerning the relationship between grace and free will, namely the possibility of seeing God and the way in which God is present in man.<sup>69</sup>

The point of departure of Augustine's thoughts on seeing God in his letter to Paulina, which is also called *De videndo Deo* (= *Ep.* 147 from 413), is the seeming disparity of scriptural statements: "No one has seen God at any time" (John 1:18), and yet he was seen by some men (cf. Gen. 32:30); moreover, those who are pure in heart "shall see God" (Matt. 5:8), and the children of God will even see him "as he is" in eternity (1 John 3:2).<sup>70</sup>

Man surely has no ability to see God (*potestas videndi*), says Augustine; there is only the grace to see him (*gratia videndi Deum*).<sup>71</sup> By nature (*natura*), God is invisible, but he may decide by his will (*voluntas*) to whom he will reveal himself.<sup>72</sup> The immutable substance of God (*substantia*) remains hidden, and it is only the changeable "appearance" (*species*) in which he had chosen to reveal himself that is shown.<sup>73</sup> The men to whom God showed

<sup>65</sup> See *Ep.* 190,6,20: CSEL 57, 155.

<sup>66</sup> See *Ep.* 190,4,14: CSEL 57, 148 f.

<sup>67</sup> See below, chap. III.3.4 incl. n. 142.

<sup>68</sup> See below, chap. III.2.8.

<sup>69</sup> Both works dealt with in this chapter, *De videndo Deo* and *De praesentia Dei* (together with several minor texts by Augustine), were published in a German-Latin edition with an extensive introductory study by E. Naab, *Über Schau und Gegenwart des unsichtbaren Gottes (Texte mit Einführung und Übersetzung)*, Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt 1998.

<sup>70</sup> See *Ep.* 147,5,12–13: CSEL 44, 285 f.; *Ep.* 147,6,18: CSEL 44, 290.

<sup>71</sup> See *Ep.* 147,6,18: CSEL 44, 291.

<sup>72</sup> See *Ep.* 147,7,19: CSEL 44, 292.

<sup>73</sup> See *Ep.* 147,8,20: CSEL 44, 293.

himself in a form in which he had chosen (e.g. in a dream or in ecstasy: *exstasis*) thus did not see him as he is.<sup>74</sup> This is only promised to his sons in the life to come<sup>75</sup> (and perhaps, by way of anticipation, to those whose minds are removed from this life to that life: *raptus* from 2 Cor. 12:2–4<sup>76</sup>). However, not even the vision of God in the life to come means becoming the same as God and being equal to him, but rather “seeing” him by clinging to him in an incorporeal way (*incorporaliter adhaerere*).<sup>77</sup>

While God’s hiddenness and the seeing of his appearances are depicted by means of a metaphor of the unavailable wills of others, which can only be recognised from their speech,<sup>78</sup> eschatological participation in God is described in the biblical way as being “one spirit with Him” (1 Cor. 6:17).<sup>79</sup> For it is one thing to see an appearance and it is another to grasp wholly what is hidden in it just as a man grasps his will wholly (at least that is what Augustine says).<sup>80</sup> Seeing God in this life means seeing his appearance, which we do not grasp in its fullness; seeing him in the life to come means clinging to the will of God and becoming one with it.

And yet, it is possible to “cling to God” in this life, and God may be present in man differently than he, in his *ubiquitas*, is present everywhere. This is the issue which Augustine brings to the fore in his letter to Dardanus, also named *De praesentia Dei* (= *Ep.* 187 from 417).

Undoubtedly, God is present everywhere; moreover, he is present everywhere “wholly” (as he has no parts) and everywhere in all his three persons. This does not mean, however, that he is “extended through space” or present as a quality of the world, but that he is the creator of the world (*substantia creatrix*), governing and sustaining it.<sup>81</sup> One should distinguish carefully between God’s omnipresence and God’s “dwelling”, bestowed by grace (*habitationis gratia*) on those who have become his “temple” (1 Cor. 3:16).<sup>82</sup>

<sup>74</sup> See *Ep.* 147,19,47: *CSEL* 44, 322 f.

<sup>75</sup> See *Ep.* 147,9,22: *CSEL* 44, 296 f.; *Ep.* 147,11,26: *CSEL* 44, 299 f.

<sup>76</sup> See *Ep.* 147,13,31: *CSEL* 44, 305.

<sup>77</sup> *Dominus enim spiritus est* (2 Cor. 3:17); *unde, qui adhaeret domino, unus spiritus est* (1 Cor. 6:17); *proinde, qui potest Deum invisibiliter videre, ipse Deo potest incorporaliter adhaerere* (*Ep.* 147,15,37: *CSEL* 44, 311 f.). See the whole passage in *Ep.* 147,15,36–37: *CSEL* 44, 309–312.

<sup>78</sup> See *Ep.* 147,2,7: *CSEL* 44, 281; *Ep.* 147,19,47: *CSEL* 44, 323.

<sup>79</sup> See *Ep.* 147,15,37: *CSEL* 44, 311 f.

<sup>80</sup> See *Ep.* 147,9,21: *CSEL* 44, 295.

<sup>81</sup> See *Ep.* 187,4,14–15: *CSEL* 57, 92 f.; *Ep.* 187,4,11: *CSEL* 57, 90.

<sup>82</sup> See *Ep.* 187,5,16: *CSEL* 57, 93 f.



While God's omnipresence cannot be more or less intensive, but is equal everywhere, his dwelling may have different intensities with different people. By receiving his likeness, men are said to draw near to God, while those who, by sinning, have become unlike him are said to be far from him.<sup>83</sup> God is not possessed by those in whom he dwells, but he is wholly present everywhere, remaining in himself (*in se ipso*) and eternally steadfast:

But, in the case of God, if less is received by the one in whom He is present, He is not thereby lessened. For He is entire in Himself, and He is not present in any such way as to need them, as if He could not exist except in them. Just as He is not absent from the one in whom He does not dwell, but is wholly present even though this one does not possess Him, so He is wholly present in the one in whom He does dwell, although this does not receive Him wholly.<sup>84</sup>

Nor does God distribute himself among those in whom he dwells, but they grasp him according to their diverse capacities without possessing him—just as people receive sound according to the capacity of their hearing, and yet the sound is not divided or possessed by anyone.<sup>85</sup>

God, equally present everywhere and dwelling in various people in various intensities according to their own capacities, distributes varieties of gifts (*donationes*) to people or allots to them various ministries (*officia*) (cf. 1 Cor. 12:4–6).<sup>86</sup>

God's dwelling in man, says Augustine, is not entirely identical to the knowledge of God. For one thing, it is possible to know God, but not glorify him (Rom. 1:21) and thus lose his closeness; for another, God may dwell even

<sup>83</sup> See Ep. 187,5,17: CSEL 57, 94f.

<sup>84</sup> *At vero Deus non, si minus capitur ab illo, cui praesens est, ideo ipse minor est. Totus enim in seipso est, nec in quibus est, ita est ut indigeat eis, tamquam non possit esse nisi in eis. Sicut autem nec ab illo abest, in quo non habitat, et totus adest, quamvis eum ille non habeat, ita et illi, in quo habitat, totus est praesens, quamvis non ex toto eum capiat* (Ep. 187,6,18: CSEL 57, 97). English translation by W. Parsons, 235.

<sup>85</sup> *Neque enim ad habitandum dividit se per hominum corda seu corpora aliam sui partem huic tribuens illi aliam sicut lux ista per aditus et fenestras domorum, sed potius, si quemlibet sonum, cum corporea res sit ac transitoria, surdus non capit surdaster non totum capit, atque in his, qui audiunt, cum pariter ei propinquent, tanto magis alius alio capit, quanto est acutioris, tanto autem minus, quanto est obtusioris auditus, cum ille non varie magis minusve insonet, sed in eo loco, in quo sunt, omnibus aequaliter praesto sit, quanto excellentius Deus natura incorporea et inmutabiliter viva, qui non sicut sonus per moras temporum tendi et dividi potest nec spatio aereo tamquam loco suo indiget, ubi praesentibus praesto sit, sed aeterna stabilitate in se ipso manens totus adesse rebus omnibus potest et singulis totus, quamvis, in quibus habitat, habeant eum pro suae capacitatis diversitate alii amplius alii minus, quos ipse sibi dilectissimum templum gratia suae bonitatis aedificat* (Ep. 187,6,19: CSEL 57, 97f.).

<sup>86</sup> See Ep. 187,6,20: CSEL 57, 98f.

in those who have not known him yet, e.g. in baptised infants. It is only the union of knowledge (*nosse*) and dwelling (*habere*) which, in Augustine's opinion, means real happiness.<sup>87</sup> Towards this the dwelling of God in man is directed, gradually growing in those who God has called, justified and glorified long before they can even know his omnipresence:

... [O]f the mortals in whom He dwells He justifies the proficient in goodness more and more as they are renewed from day to day, hears them when they pray, cleanses them when they confess their sins, that He may present them to Himself as a pure and everlasting temple ... And He is rightly said to dwell in those whom He has called according to His purpose, and whom He has received in order to justify and glorify them even before they are able to know His incorporeal omnipresent nature, as far as it can be known *in part, through a glass, in a dark manner* (1Cor. 13:12), by man in this life, although he has made great progress.<sup>88</sup>

A unique grace (*singularis gratia*) was granted to the man Jesus, who became one person with the Word.<sup>89</sup> As a result of his miraculous birth, he was exempted from the sin which burdens the human race and is transmitted through the concupiscence of procreation, and he established the new human race, into which men are not born naturally, but which they enter through spiritual rebirth.<sup>90</sup> This is a way in which men may become the “temple” in which God dwells.<sup>91</sup>

In his letters *De videndo Deo* and *De praesentia Dei*, Augustine presents the doctrine of grace from a different perspective than that of the relationship between the human will and God's grace. Grace is perceived here as a special way of God's dwelling in men based on baptism and intensified by men's growing in likeness to God until blissful eternity, in which men will be so “united” with God that they will know him and see him as he is (not only in the various appearances in which God presumably shows himself to

<sup>87</sup> See *Ep.* 187,6,21: CSEL 57, 99f. On *Deum habere* in the early Augustine, see above, chap. I.1.1.

<sup>88</sup> ... *proficientes, in quibus mortalibus habitat, dum de die in diem renovantur, magis magisque iustificet, exaudiat orantes, mundet confitentes, ut exhibeat sibi templum immaculatum in aeternum ... Et merito dicitur habitare in eis, quos secundum propositum vocatos iustificandos glorificandosque suscepit etiam ante, quam incorpoream, quae ubique tota est, valeant eius nosse naturam, quantum nosci ex parte per speculum et in aenigmate ab homine in hac vita, cum plurimum profecerit, potest* (*Ep.* 187,8,29: CSEL 57, 106). English translation after W. Parsons, 243f.

<sup>89</sup> See *Ep.* 187,13,40: CSEL 57, 117. On Augustine's “Christology of grace” in this letter, see J. McW. Dewart, “The Christology of the Pelagian Controversy”, in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1993, 1231f.

<sup>90</sup> See *Ep.* 187,9,30–31: CSEL 57, 107–109.

<sup>91</sup> See *Ep.* 187,12,36: CSEL 57, 114.

men now). The grace of God's dwelling in men and men's clinging to God is made possible by the spiritual rebirth of men into a new human race as it was established by the man Christ.

### 2.3. *The Grace of the New Testament* (De gratia Novi testamenti)

The role of the coming of Christ and the new covenant established by it are the points of departure of *De gratia Novi testamenti* (= *Ep.* 140),<sup>92</sup> Augustine's reply to five biblical questions of his correspondent Honoratus from 412, in which Augustine also employs a perspective partially different from the anti-Pelagian one. Just like Augustine himself, Honoratus, now a Christian catechumen, was originally of the Manichaean creed and his questions are marked by anti-Manichaean issues.<sup>93</sup> To the rather partial questions Augustine adds a sixth one, "What is the grace of the New Testament?", so that he could clarify the other ones in a better-founded way.<sup>94</sup>

Augustine touches again on the polarity of the law and grace, attributed to the Old and New Covenants, though not primarily with regard to their difference in terms of their relationship to the law (inner—outer, fear—love), but mainly with regard to the difference in promises.

In Augustine's anthropology, the human rational soul (*anima rationalis*) takes a middle position (*in quadam medietate posita*) between the sensual and the intelligible, between the temporal and the eternal, and in its striving (when childhood is over, as it is connected solely with the sensory) it may follow one or the other as its ultimate goal.<sup>95</sup> While the Old Testament turned the attention of men towards temporal things (the cult immolating material things, the Promised Land etc.), the New Testament leads them towards spiritual things: the promised reward is not temporary and material, but eternal and spiritual, to which, in Augustine's opinion, the whole nature of Christianity corresponds. The Old Testament promise, too, is interpreted by the Christians not in a literal, material sense, but in a spiritual sense which was hidden in the Old Testament and revealed in the New

<sup>92</sup> On this work, see G. Bonner, "The Significance of Augustine's *De gratia Novi Testamenti*", in: *Augustiniana*, 41, 1991, 531–559 (reprinted in: G. Bonner, *Church*, n. IV); P.-M. Hombert, *Gloria*, 172–181.

<sup>93</sup> On the datation of the work and the identity of Honoratus, see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 133–154.

<sup>94</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 1.2: CSEL 44, 156.

<sup>95</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 2.3: CSEL 44, 156 f.

Testament.<sup>96</sup> According to Augustine, the sense of these promises consists in grace revealed in the New Testament, i.e., in the incarnation of the Son of God,<sup>97</sup> which enables those who believe in it to become children of God as well, but in their case by adoption, in “spiritual birth”, not naturally:

This is the grace of the New Testament, which lay hid in the Old, yet was constantly prophesied and foretold by veiled figures, so that the soul might recognise its God and be reborn to Him, by His grace. This is truly a spiritual birth ... This is called adoption. ... From this begetting by grace we distinguish that son who, although He was the Son of God, came that He might become the son of man ... By His grace we became what we were not, that is, the sons of God. Still, we were something, and this same something was much lower, that is, sons of men. He therefore descended that we might ascend, and, while remaining in His own nature, became a sharer in our nature, so that we, while remaining in our own nature, might become sharers in His nature.<sup>98</sup>

Thus men become what they were not before (children of God), just as the Son of God became what he had not been before (i.e., man), and by participation in God as the immutable good they attain an eternal happy life.<sup>99</sup>

Christ's participation in the human body and soul<sup>100</sup> transforms our “sinful flesh” into his own sinless body: the church as his bride, united with him in one body.<sup>101</sup> In the hearts of those who believe the Holy Spirit is poured out, who endows men with love and a new relationship to the commandments of the law.<sup>102</sup> The fear of God yields up to the love that has been poured,<sup>103</sup> which would fulfil the commandments freely even if the transgression were non-punishable. This love, through which the soul clings to

<sup>96</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 2,5: CSEL 44, 158.

<sup>97</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 3,6: CSEL 44, 158.

<sup>98</sup> *Haec est gratia novi testamenti, quod in vetere latuit nec tamen figuris obumbrantibus prophetari pronuntiarique cessavit, ut intellegat anima Deum suum et gratia eius renascatur illi. Haec quippe nativitas spiritalis est ... Haec etiam adoptio vocatur. ... Et ab hac generatione gratiae discernitur ille filius, qui, cum esset filius Dei, venit, ut fieret filius hominis ... Nos quoque per eius gratiam facti sumus, quod non eramus, id est filii Dei; sed tamen aliquid eramus et hoc ipsum aliquid multo inferius, hoc est filii hominum. Descendit ergo ille, ut nos ascenderemus, et manens in sua natura factus est particeps naturae nostrae, ut et nos manentes in natura nostra efficeremur participes naturae ipsius* (*De grat. Novi Test.* 3,9–4,10: CSEL 44, 161f.). English translation after W. Parsons, 64f.

<sup>99</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 36,82: CSEL 44, 230.

<sup>100</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 4,12: CSEL 44, 163.

<sup>101</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 6,18: CSEL 44, 168.

<sup>102</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 4,11: CSEL 44, 162.

<sup>103</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 18,45: CSEL 44, 193.

God, also contains a component of fear, a “chaste fear” (*timor castus*) by which the soul fears to lose what it was given: it fears to lose the grace which caused it to take delight in not sinning (*ut non peccare delectet*):

Fear, then, is not in charity, because *perfect charity casts out fear* (1John 4:18), but that fear is a servile fear; it is the fear that makes anyone refrain from evil through dread of punishment, not for joy in justice. Charity casts out this fear; a charity that finds no pleasure in evil-doing, even if it were suggested that no punishment would follow; but it does not cast out the fear by which the soul is afraid of losing that very grace which makes her take pleasure in avoiding sin (*non peccare delectet*), or the fear she has that God may forsake her, even though He afflicted her with no special penalty of suffering.<sup>104</sup>

Only this love, which loves God for his own sake (*gratis amandus*), is the proper reverence for God,<sup>105</sup> because it is the only adequate response to God’s grace given freely (*gratis*). The understanding of the freely given gifts of God and of his love itself (*intellectus gratiae*<sup>106</sup>) thus changes into an attitude of gratefulness (*gratias agere*).<sup>107</sup>

The love of God for his own sake, says Augustine, is not limited to the New Testament period: its biblical prototype (which has already been mentioned<sup>108</sup>) is Job, as an example of a man who does not serve God because of temporal things, or rather, whose loyalty does not depend on them. Nevertheless, he is rewarded for his loyalty—as Augustine says, it cannot have been otherwise in the Old Testament era—by temporal things (Job 42:10). This “veil” of the Old Testament account is to be revealed by the Christian readers, who should hope to receive eternal goods, not temporal ones;<sup>109</sup> in other words, in the story of Job, they are to recognise a message of love of God for his own sake, which does not ask any other reward except that it does not “lose the grace” of being close to God.<sup>110</sup> This love, as Augustine’s

---

<sup>104</sup> *Timor ergo non est in caritate, quia perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem sed illum servilem, illum, quo, cum se quisque ab opere malo abstinere, poena terretur, non iustitia delectatur; hunc foras caritas mittit, quam non delectat iniquitas, etiamsi proponatur impunitas, non illum, quo timet anima, ne amittat ipsam gratiam, qua in illa factum est, ut eam non peccare delectet, quo timet, ne Deus eam deserat, etiamsi nullis dolorum cruciatibus puniat* (*De grat. Novi Test.* 21,53; *CSEL* 44, 199). English translation after W. Parsons, 101 f.

<sup>105</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 17,44–18,45; *CSEL* 44, 192 f.

<sup>106</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 20,51; *CSEL* 44, 198.

<sup>107</sup> *Haec est gratia, quae gratis datur non meritis operantis sed miseratione donantis. Hinc gratias agimus domino Deo nostro, quod est magnum sacramentum in sacrificio novi testamenti ...* (*De grat. Novi Test.* 19,48; *CSEL* 44, 195 f.).

<sup>108</sup> See above, chap. II.3.2 incl. n. 66.

<sup>109</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 10,26; *CSEL* 44, 176 f.

<sup>110</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 21,53; *CSEL* 44, 199.

account shows, must be perceived as a turning from temporal things to eternal ones, as “another happiness” (*alia felicitas*<sup>111</sup>), towards which human attention is directed by the grace of the New Testament instead of the earthly hopes of the Old Testament.

The freely given love of God in the New Testament era, when grace was revealed,<sup>112</sup> also involves humility, which Augustine emphasises greatly: *intellectus gratiae* shows that good works which men do out of love of God cannot be attributed to men themselves (who with their wills do only evil<sup>113</sup>), but must be used for the praise of the Lord, who endowed them with his grace. This “affection” (*affectus*) of humility or gratitude,<sup>114</sup> namely the “affection of internal grace” (*affectus internae gratiae*), which is related to its “understanding” (*intelligentia gratiae*) or may even be identical to it,<sup>115</sup> is, in Augustine’s opinion, the true intention (*intentio*) of the grace of the New Testament.<sup>116</sup>

Although the answer to Honoratus (from 412) is related to the commencement of Augustine’s anti-Pelagian campaign, and Augustine warns here about the “enemies” of grace,<sup>117</sup> the purport of his account rather resembles his older works. Grace is presented here as a gift of participation in the immutable good, as an adoption of men as the children of God, made possible by the incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God, and as a freely given gift of love which is poured out into the hearts of men and which loves God for his own sake. The “affective” moment of this attitude is clearly present here. *Intellectus gratiae*, i.e., the understanding that grace is given *gratis* and thus the only appropriate response to it is love which also loves *gratis*, is related to the “affection” of inner grace, a state in which man takes “delight”

<sup>111</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 9,24: CSEL 44, 175.

<sup>112</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 3,6: CSEL 44, 158.

<sup>113</sup> *Animae igitur rationalis mutabilitas admonetur, quo noverit nisi participatione incommutabilis boni iustam, salvam, sapientem, beatam se esse non posse nec sibi eam bonum esse posse propria voluntate sed malum. Propria quippe voluntate avertitur a bono incommutabili eaque aversione vitiatur; nec sanari per se ipsam potest sed gratuita misericordia sui creatoris* (*De grat. Novi Test.* 31,74: CSEL 44, 221).

<sup>114</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 29,70: CSEL 44, 217 f.

<sup>115</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 37,84: CSEL 44, 232 f. Here Augustine interprets the oil in the lamps of the wise virgins, who are well prepared for the coming of the bridegroom (see Matt. 25:1–13), as an “understanding of the grace of God” (*intelligentia gratiae*), whereas the foolish virgins lack the “affection of internal grace” (*affectus internae gratiae*). From his exposition it is not clear whether in this passage *intelligentia* and *affectus* represent identical capacities, or complementary ones.

<sup>116</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 37,85: CSEL 44, 234.

<sup>117</sup> *De grat. Novi Test.* 37,83: CSEL 44, 231.

in not sinning and therefore does not sin (even if it were non-punishable). It is probably this “affection”, the inner experience of grace, which causes men to take delight in what is right and gives them the power to overcome sin, that Augustine regards as the distinctive feature of grace, which he sets out to defend against the Pelagians and which he introduces in this treatise as a substantial part of Christian catechesis.

#### 2.4. *Christian Existence As a Struggle with Concupiscence* (*Sermones 151–156 on Rom. 7:5–8:17*)

The motif of the Old and New Testaments as the law of works and the law of faith, i.e., as the law whose commands cause fear and, in contrast, grace which gives love,<sup>118</sup> also appears in a series of six sermons on Rom. 7:5–8:17,<sup>119</sup> delivered by Augustine in Carthage, probably in the autumn of 417.<sup>120</sup> The opponent that Augustine openly addresses here is the Manichaean exposition of Paul’s words, according to which “flesh” and “spirit” are two natures originating in different principles (*duas ex diversis principiis naturas*), with men fluctuating in the midst of their conflict,<sup>121</sup> and which rejects the law of Moses as a product of the carnal principle, i.e., as “evil” and contradicting the Gospel.<sup>122</sup>

Against the concept of two natures of two different origins, Augustine gives a picture of a single good nature, though one corrupted by sin (*vitiata*),<sup>123</sup> whose weakness (*languor*)<sup>124</sup> is passed on in the human race, beginning with Adam, together with nature itself.<sup>125</sup> At the same time, this weak-

<sup>118</sup> *Serm.* 152,7: CCL 41Ba, 41f.; *Serm.* 152,11: CCL 41Ba, 46; *Serm.* 154,1: CCL 41Ba, 76; *Serm.* 155,6: CCL 41Ba, 113f.; *Serm.* 156,14: CCL 41Ba, 156f.

<sup>119</sup> The sermons consist of two series: *Serm.* 151–152 is an exposition of Rom. 7:15–8,4; *Serm.* 153–156 deals with Rom. 7:5–8:17; cf. G. Partoens, “Introduction”, in: CCL 41Ba, LVI–LXIV.

<sup>120</sup> The discussion on the dating of the sermons is summarised in G. Partoens, “Introduction”, VII–XXII, who favours their dating to October 417 or May 418. A similar conclusion appears in J. Lössl (ibid. XXIII–XXXII; LV), who argues that with respect to their content, the sermons better fit the situation before the condemnation of Pelagius and Caecilius by the imperial edict and by the synod of Carthage on 30 April and 1 May 418, respectively.

<sup>121</sup> *Serm.* 152,4: CCL 41Ba, 36; similarly also *Serm.* 154,9: CCL 41Ba, 88f.; *Serm.* 154,13: CCL 41Ba, 95; *Serm.* 155,11: CCL 41Ba, 123.

<sup>122</sup> *Serm.* 152,6: CCL 41Ba, 39f.; *Serm.* 153,2–5: CCL 41Ba, 50–56; *Serm.* 153,12: CCL 41Ba, 68.

<sup>123</sup> *Serm.* 155,13: CCL 41Ba, 127.

<sup>124</sup> *Serm.* 151,3: CCL 41Ba, 17f.; *Serm.* 152,4: CCL 41Ba, 36; *Serm.* 154,13: CCL 41Ba, 95.

<sup>125</sup> *Serm.* 151,5: CCL 41Ba, 21; *Serm.* 153,14: CCL 41Ba, 71f.

ness brings about guilt (*reatus*), which is effaced by baptism, but the weakness itself remains in the form of concupiscence.<sup>126</sup> According to the apostle, it is a “sin that dwells in me” (Rom. 7:20), “that is, in my flesh” (Rom. 7:18), because it is concupiscence from which sins arise.<sup>127</sup> Even here, in Augustine’s opinion, the main sphere, and the medium of transmission of this perverted desire (*cupiditas mala*<sup>128</sup>) as well, is libidinous procreation, as we can see in the story of the first men in paradise (Gen. 3), whose disobedience to God was punished through the shameful motion of their genitals, which then had to be covered with fig-leaves.<sup>129</sup>

Augustine also illustrates concupiscence by means of drunkenness (*concupiscencia potandi*)<sup>130</sup> in order to show its snare, or “carnal concupiscence”. This must be opposed with one’s will; in other words, the mind must not consent to it because each consent increases the power of the “evil habit” (*adversaria*, or *mala consuetudo*) instead of reducing it, i.e., withholding it.<sup>131</sup> Following Paul’s text (Rom. 7:25), Augustine gives a vivid picture of the conflict in which “I myself”, “the same I”,<sup>132</sup> find myself between the spirit, i.e., the mind, which is I myself, and the flesh, which is I as well (*caro enim mea est, ego ipse sum, pars mea est*),<sup>133</sup> albeit indirectly, because the body is controlled by the mind.<sup>134</sup> That is why the body (the “small good”) should be genuinely subordinated to the soul (as the “great good”), just as the soul is to be subordinated to God (as the “supreme good”).<sup>135</sup> The point is not to repudiate the body completely, but to gain control over it (*portare carnem, non a carne portari*):<sup>136</sup> just like in a domestic dispute, the point is not to renounce the wife, but to tame her (at least according to Augustine).<sup>137</sup> Christian life, including the lives of the righteous and holy ones, is presented here as a

<sup>126</sup> *Serm.* 152,3: *CCL* 41Ba, 35 f. In one passage, Augustine mentions concupiscence as what sets the libido in motion (*Serm.* 153,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 59 f.).

<sup>127</sup> *Serm.* 155,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 105.

<sup>128</sup> *Serm.* 155,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 105.

<sup>129</sup> *Serm.* 151,5: *CCL* 41Ba, 23.

<sup>130</sup> *Serm.* 151,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 19.

<sup>131</sup> *Serm.* 151,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 19 f.

<sup>132</sup> ... *non enim duae naturae contrariae, sed ex utroque unus homo; quia unus Deus a quo factus est homo—igitur ipse ego (ego ipse!) mente servio legi Dei, carne autem legi peccati* (*Serm.* 154,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 88 f.).

<sup>133</sup> *Serm.* 151,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 25.

<sup>134</sup> ... *magis sum ego in eo quo rego, quam in eo in quo regor* (*Serm.* 154,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 91).

<sup>135</sup> *Serm.* 156,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 144 f.

<sup>136</sup> *Serm.* 155,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 125.

<sup>137</sup> *Serm.* 152,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 36.



constant fight (*bellum*,<sup>138</sup> *militia*,<sup>139</sup> *pugna*,<sup>140</sup> *certamen*<sup>141</sup>) against concupiscence, with the victory being reserved to the age to come:

And in this warfare consists the whole life of holy people. Now what am I to say about the impure, who don't even put up a fight? They are subjugated and dragged around; no, they are even not dragged around, because they follow willingly of their own accord. This, I repeat, is the battle of the saints; and in this warfare you are always at risk, until you die.<sup>142</sup>

Even a spiritual man still lives in a body marked by concupiscence, being “the same person, at once spiritual and carnal” (*idem spiritalis, idemque carnalis*).<sup>143</sup> He cannot quite free himself from concupiscence (*non concupiscere*), he can only resist succumbing to it (*post concupiscentias suas non ire*, cf. Ecclus. 18:30).<sup>144</sup> In this respect, he may want the good, but he cannot “perform” it (*perficere*, cf. Rom. 7:18), because he cannot eradicate concupiscence completely from this mortal body.<sup>145</sup>

However, the main purport of Augustine's sermons is not doctrinal, but parenetic: even after baptism, concupiscence remains in the “body of death” (Rom. 7:24). The will must withhold it in order to deserve eternal life free from it, i.e., “a spiritual body” (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44),<sup>146</sup> one which does not withhold the spirit, or the body-friend (*caro mea amica*),<sup>147</sup> which will be endowed with immortality.<sup>148</sup>

The only man who did not succumb to sin and death is Christ, born from grace, not from concupiscence.<sup>149</sup> He took on death voluntarily, not out of necessity,<sup>150</sup> so that he might save men from it. “He condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3) when he was made “to be sin” (2 Cor. 5:21) in order to become “a sacrifice for sin” (the Old Testament often speaks of “sin” when

<sup>138</sup> *Serm.* 151,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 14.

<sup>139</sup> *Serm.* 156,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 149.

<sup>140</sup> *Serm.* 154,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 87.

<sup>141</sup> *Serm.* 152,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 35.

<sup>142</sup> *Et in isto bello est tota vita sanctorum. Iam quid dicam de immundis, qui nec pugnant? Subiugati pertrahuntur—nec pertrahuntur, quia libenter sequuntur. Haec, inquam, est pugna sanctorum et in hoc bello semper homo periclitatur, quousque moriatur* (*Serm.* 151,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 26). English translation by E. Hill, 44 f.

<sup>143</sup> *Serm.* 154,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 86.

<sup>144</sup> *Serm.* 154,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 86.

<sup>145</sup> *Serm.* 151,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 25; *Serm.* 152,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 35; *Serm.* 154,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 93–95.

<sup>146</sup> *Serm.* 154,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 88.

<sup>147</sup> *Serm.* 155,15: *CCL* 41Ba, 130.

<sup>148</sup> *Serm.* 154,17: *CCL* 41Ba, 100.

<sup>149</sup> *Serm.* 152,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 42; *Serm.* 153,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 71 f.

<sup>150</sup> *Serm.* 152,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 43.

“a sacrifice for sin” is meant, Augustine explains).<sup>151</sup> Christ was sent by God “in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Rom. 8:3), which, however, did not succumb to sin,<sup>152</sup> in order to overcome the body as the seat of concupiscence, thus saving the body as well, not only the spirit, for immortality: God “sent flesh against flesh; or rather he also sent flesh on behalf of flesh”.<sup>153</sup> That is how Christ also redeemed his body, meaning the church, for he (who did not need redemption) paid not only for himself, but for “Peter” as well, i.e., for the church, as we can read in the Gospel concerning taxes paid to the emperor (cf. Matt. 17:24–27).<sup>154</sup>

In the atmosphere of the spiritual struggle in which Augustine’s sermons are set, the apostle Paul also becomes an example of a brave fighter against concupiscence.<sup>155</sup> That is how one should interpret his words concerning the struggle of the flesh against the spirit and the human condition split between the “delight in the law of God” and the “law in my members” warring against the will (Rom. 7:22–23). The apostle does not say, “I do what I will not to do” (Rom. 7:16) because he succumbs to concupiscence (such an interpretation must be flatly rejected as not worthy of the apostle<sup>156</sup>), but because he cannot eradicate it completely in this life; instead, he has to struggle with it. He does not will it, he withholds it, but it keeps on pleading and seducing him: *Volo non concupiscere et concupisco*.<sup>157</sup> “For what I am doing, I do not understand” (Rom. 7:15); in other words, I do not give my consent to concupiscence.<sup>158</sup> The apostle is not speaking on behalf of somebody else, a man “under the law”—as Augustine used to maintain and as the Pelagian interpreters have it<sup>159</sup>—but he speaks for himself,<sup>160</sup> i.e., on behalf of a man who has already received grace and who is putting up a fight now, struggling with exceptional persistence, but who,

<sup>151</sup> *Serm.* 152,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 45 f.; *Serm.* 155,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 118 f.

<sup>152</sup> *Serm.* 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 115 f.

<sup>153</sup> *Contra carnem misit carnem, immo etiam pro carne misit carnem* (*Serm.* 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 115). English translation by E. Hill, 88.

<sup>154</sup> *Serm.* 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 116 f.

<sup>155</sup> *Serm.* 151,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 24.

<sup>156</sup> *Serm.* 151,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 13 f.; *Serm.* 154,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 78 f.

<sup>157</sup> *Serm.* 154,3: *CCL* 41Ba, 79; similarly also *Serm.* 151,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 23; *Serm.* 154,10: *CCL* 41Ba, 90 f.

<sup>158</sup> *Serm.* 154,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 92.

<sup>159</sup> ... *exsistunt qui dicant quod alium in te nescio quem transfiguraveris laborantem, deficientem, victum, captivum* (*Serm.* 154,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 80). On Augustine’s previous exposition of Rom. 7 see above, chap. I.3.3b, n. 95. II.1.1. On Pelagius’ interpretation see below, III.2.8, n. 347.

<sup>160</sup> *Serm.* 154,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 96.

as we know from his own account, has not reached perfection yet (cf. Phil. 3:12).<sup>161</sup>

Although the polemic against the Pelagians is not explicit in Augustine's sermons, his aim of facing their ideas is still perceptible. Augustine even quotes Pelagius' treatise defending the free choice of the will (*Pro libero arbitrio*) in order to reject his concept of grace, according to which it helps the will to fulfil God's commandments "more easily": "The reason,' they say, 'why God has given his grace to people, is to enable them to fulfil more easily by grace what they are commanded to do by free will.'"<sup>162</sup> In Augustine's opinion, grace does not only make the fulfilment of God's commandments easier, it makes it possible as such: it is not like the wind which makes sailing easier while one can also reach the destination by means of rowing, or like draught animals which make travelling easier while one can also travel on foot.<sup>163</sup> "Without me you can do nothing" (John 15:5): "This isn't what Augustine says, it's what the Lord says," as the bishop of Hippo assures his Carthaginian audience.<sup>164</sup> God does not only watch us struggle, but helps us with our fight inasmuch as we ask him.<sup>165</sup>

The law of Moses does not facilitate the struggle; it only imposes it (*iubet, non iuvat*).<sup>166</sup> It commands, "You shall not covet" (Rom. 7:7; cf. Exod. 20:17; Deut. 5:21)—the "law" seems to be reduced to this single commandment for Augustine<sup>167</sup>—but it does not help fulfil what it commands under the threat of punishment. Despite this, the law of Moses was not evil or useless (for it was written by the "finger of God", i.e., the Holy Spirit<sup>168</sup>), because it reveals the weakness of man and his incompetence and thus makes him find a doctor:<sup>169</sup> "now all that remains to him is to call out for grace, because he couldn't keep the law."<sup>170</sup> It is the law which makes sin "appear" (Rom. 7:13), and the coming of the law turns the sinner into a transgressor (*praevaricator*), i.e., a

<sup>161</sup> *Serm.* 154,3–4: *CCL* 41Ba, 79–81.

<sup>162</sup> "*Ad hoc,*" *inquiunt, "Deus gratiam suam dedit hominibus, ut quod facere per liberum iubentur arbitrium, facilius possint implere per gratiam"* (*Serm.* 156,13: *CCL* 41Ba, 154). English translation after E. Hill, 104. See also J. Lössl, "Introduction", XLIX–LV.

<sup>163</sup> *Serm.* 156,12–13: *CCL* 41Ba, 153f.

<sup>164</sup> *Non haec dicit Augustinus, haec dicit Dominus* (*Serm.* 156,13: *CCL* 41Ba, 154).

<sup>165</sup> *Serm.* 156,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 149f.

<sup>166</sup> *Serm.* 152,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 41. Similarly also *Serm.* 155,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 107; *Serm.* 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 115.

<sup>167</sup> *Serm.* 153,5: *CCL* 41Ba, 56.

<sup>168</sup> *Serm.* 155,3: *CCL* 41Ba, 110.

<sup>169</sup> *Serm.* 154,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 77; *Serm.* 156,1–2: *CCL* 41Ba, 136f.

<sup>170</sup> *Iam restat illi gratiam invocare, quia non potuit legem servare* (*Serm.* 152,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 40). English translation by E. Hill, 52.

conscious sinner.<sup>171</sup> “The stream of concupiscence” (*fluvius concupiscentiae*), however, becomes stronger by this rather than being effectively subdued, and men thus experience their own incompetence in the struggle against it.<sup>172</sup>

That is why the Jews (and Pelagians, as Augustine implies) wrongly assume that the law on its own can provide the will with orientation and that the will alone can fulfil it:

In particular it's because of the Jews that the apostle is so persistent in saying all this and urging it on us; they were always boasting about the law, and claiming that the law was enough to direct their freedom of choice. And thus, because they claimed the law was enough to direct their freedom of choice, *being ignorant of the justice of God*, that is, of the justice given by God as a result of faith, *and wishing to establish their own*, as though it were achieved by their own powers, not obtained by the cries of faith for help, *they are not subject*, as he says, *to the justice of God* (Rom. 10:3).<sup>173</sup>

It surely is necessary not to yield to concupiscence, says Augustine, but the victory is not in the power of the human will, and we cannot boast even a partial success as if it were our own and as if we did not owe it to the help of the Holy Spirit.<sup>174</sup> That is why Augustine warns against pride which maintains that it can succeed on its own: he thus argues not only against the Jews, but also against Gentile philosophy in the two forms which the apostle Paul faced at the Areopagus (Acts 17:18); i.e., not only against Epicurean philosophy, which, according to Augustine, seeks happiness in physical pleasure, but also against Stoicism, which sees it in the power, or virtue (*virtus*<sup>175</sup>), of one's own soul. In contrast to this, the apostle posits “drawing near to God” (Ps. 72[73]:28) and trust in God (cf. Ps. 39:5[40:4]) as happiness.<sup>176</sup> Christians cannot rely on their own powers<sup>177</sup>—as that would

<sup>171</sup> *Serm.* 153,6: CCL 41Ba, 58f. Similarly also *Serm.* 151,7: CCL 41Ba, 27; *Serm.* 155,4: CCL 41Ba, 111.

<sup>172</sup> *Serm.* 153,7: CCL 41Ba, 59f.

<sup>173</sup> *Ad hoc assidue dicit et commendat ista apostolus propter Iudaeos, qui de lege gloriabantur et libero suo arbitrio legem sufficere arbitrabantur. Ac per hoc quia libero arbitrio suo legem sufficere arbitrabantur ignorantes Dei iustitiam—id est ex fide iustitiam a Deo datam—et suam volentes constituere—quasi suis viribus impletam, non clamante fide impetratam—iustitiae Dei, sicut dicit, non sunt subiecti* (*Serm.* 156,4: CCL 41Ba, 140f.). English translation by E. Hill, 98f.

<sup>174</sup> *Serm.* 156,10: CCL 41Ba, 150f.

<sup>175</sup> *Exstiterunt autem alii superbi: quasi a carne se removentes, et totam spem beatitudinis suae in anima sua constituentes posuerunt summum bonum in virtute sua. ... Tales fuerunt philosophi qui stoici nuncupati sunt* (*Serm.* 156,7: CCL 41Ba, 146).

<sup>176</sup> *Serm.* 156,7: CCL 41Ba, 146–148.

<sup>177</sup> *Serm.* 154,17: CCL 41Ba, 100f.

mean being still “in the flesh”<sup>178</sup>—instead, they must “emigrate from the flesh”, i.e., die with Christ (cf. Col. 3:1–3), “rise above themselves” and “be in the Spirit”, i.e., rely on God:<sup>179</sup> “What’s being in the spirit? Place your hopes in God.”<sup>180</sup> Only the Spirit can help fulfil what the law merely commands.

What the human will (*voluntas*) is like when left on its own is revealed by the example of the first men in paradise: even when still healthy, the will did not prove itself through free choice (*liberum arbitrium*), and much less so when it was taken ill with concupiscence.<sup>181</sup> Although human nature managed to hurt itself through the free choice of the will, it is not able to cure itself in the same way.<sup>182</sup> In order to do that, it needs the aid of grace as medicine,<sup>183</sup> namely love poured out into human hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5), “soothing inside” (*intus mulceat*)<sup>184</sup> because it invokes delight in the law of God and makes “the truth sweet”.<sup>185</sup> Thus grace not only forgives sins, but also strengthens the will.<sup>186</sup> Therefore, apart from the law of Moses and the law of sin and death, Augustine also finds the law of the Spirit in Paul’s text (cf. Rom. 8:2), namely the law of faith (*lex fidei*),<sup>187</sup> as only faith can fulfil the law provided it is endowed with love by God.

Because of the parenetic and combative mood of Augustine’s sermons, however, the main purport of his exposition is not human powerlessness fully dependent on grace, which follows the mystery of God’s inscrutable predestination (this is only mentioned once and very briefly<sup>188</sup>). The audience rather get the impression of a paradoxical relationship between

<sup>178</sup> *Nam si de spiritu vestro praesumitis, adhuc in carne estis* (Serm. 155,13: CCL 41Ba, 126).

<sup>179</sup> Serm. 153,9: CCL 41Ba, 62 f.

<sup>180</sup> *Quid est “in Spiritu esto”? In Deo spem pone* (Serm. 153,9: CCL 41Ba, 63). English translation by E. Hill, 62.

<sup>181</sup> *Quae [voluntas] tunc, quando erat in integra libertate—id est in paradiso—ostendit vires suas; ostendit quantum posset—sed ad ruendum, non ad surgendum* (Serm. 156,4: CCL 41Ba, 142).

<sup>182</sup> *Idonea fuit humana natura per liberum arbitrium vulnerare se, sed iam vulnerata et saucia non est idonea per liberum arbitrium sanare se* (Serm. 156,2: CCL 41Ba, 138).

<sup>183</sup> *Gratia medicina est* (Serm. 156,5: CCL 41Ba, 142).

<sup>184</sup> Serm. 155,6: CCL 41Ba, 114.

<sup>185</sup> Serm. 153,10: CCL 41Ba, 65 f. See also Serm. 155,14: CCL 41Ba, 127.

<sup>186</sup> ... *superabundavit gratia* (Rom. 5:20), *quia deleuit cuncta peccata quae invenit, et ad non peccandum voluntati nostrae conanti adiutorium subministravit, ut ipsa voluntas nostra non in se ipsa, sed in Deo laudaretur* (Serm. 155,4: CCL 41Ba, 111). Similarly also Serm. 155,9: CCL 41Ba, 121.

<sup>187</sup> Serm. 152,5: CCL 41Ba, 37 f.

<sup>188</sup> ... *misit Deus Filium suum propter praescitos, praedestinos, vocandos, iustificandos, glorificandos* ... (Serm. 155,8: CCL 41Ba, 120).

human efforts and God's aid. God only helps those who try as well: "If you weren't working, he wouldn't be working together with you."<sup>189</sup> And yet, men cannot succeed without his help; or rather, on their own, men are only capable of evil: "You can indeed act by your free will without him helping; but only badly. That's what your will, which is called free, is fit for; and by acting badly it becomes a slave deserving to be condemned."<sup>190</sup> The freedom of choice, according to Augustine, makes it possible for men to plead for help in the fight against concupiscence,<sup>191</sup> which they would not be able to put up by themselves, let alone win: "Because if he doesn't help us himself, we won't be able, I don't say to win, but even to fight."<sup>192</sup>

Augustine's Carthaginian sermons represent a good example of his rhetorical skills, by means of which, simultaneously arguing against the Manichaeans and Pelagians, he puts the teaching on corrupted human nature at the service of the "Christian struggle" with concupiscence, to which Christian existence is virtually reduced here. It is probably for the first time that the apostle Paul in Romans 7 becomes a paradigm of a man no longer under the law, but of a Christian fighter who "does what he will not to do" because he desires without meaning to;<sup>193</sup> he wants the good, but he cannot "perform" it, i.e., eradicate concupiscence completely.

Not only do Augustine's sermons not include the whole of the doctrine on grace, as it was developed in his treatises beginning with the answer to Simplicianus, but their import is almost "synergistic".

## 2.5. *The Image of God in Man and the Gift of the Spirit* (De Trinitate)

Augustine's *De Trinitate*, a treatise in fifteen books, is one of his most interesting works, both from the theological and philosophical points of view. From Augustine's own account we know that he spent a lot of time working

<sup>189</sup> *Si non esses operator, ille non esset cooperator* (Serm. 156,11: CCL 41Ba, 152). English translation by E. Hill, 103.

<sup>190</sup> *Agis quidem illo non adiuvante libera voluntate, sed male. Ad hoc idonea est voluntas tua, quae vocatur libera, et male agendo fit damnabilis ancilla* (Serm. 156,12: CCL 41Ba, 153). English translation by E. Hill, 103 f.

<sup>191</sup> *Sic ergo habete arbitrium, ut imploretis auxilium* (Serm. 155,13: CCL 41Ba, 127). A call for a plea for help also in Serm. 151,4: CCL 41Ba, 20 f.; Serm. 151,8: CCL 41Ba, 30.

<sup>192</sup> *Si enim nos ipse non adiuvat, non dico vincere, sed nec pugnare poterimus* (Serm. 156,9: CCL 41Ba, 150). English translation by E. Hill, 102.

<sup>193</sup> See J. Lössl, "Introduction", XLVI–XLVIII. According to this author, Augustine may have started his new exposition of Rom. 7 in reaction to Pelagius' treatise *Pro libero arbitrio* and also Jerome's polemic in his anti-Pelagian *Dialogue* (see J. Lössl, *ibid.*).

on it,<sup>194</sup> and despite the disparity of opinions concerning the precise dating of individual books, scholars agree that it was finished at the time of the culmination of the Pelagian crisis.<sup>195</sup> Traces of the polemic appear in this work as well, although the theme seems to be quite different. Here Augustine presents biblical and ancient Christian teachings on the Trinity in the Christian God and then he attempts at finding the traces of the triune God on all levels of reality, particularly in the most perfect image of God, i.e., in the human mind, in order that he may, in the last book, introduce his own trinitarian conception of the three consubstantial divine persons and their relations.<sup>196</sup>

### 2.5a. *The Image of God*

The idea of the image of God as we know it from Augustine's previous works<sup>197</sup> is not only elaborated on in greater depth in this treatise, but it is also transformed substantially. Augustine keeps on searching for the image of God in the mind of man;<sup>198</sup> what changes is his notion of what the mind

<sup>194</sup> See *Ep.* 174 (to Pope Aurelius): *CSEL* 44, 650 = *CCL* 50, 25. Here Augustine says about this work: "I was a young man when I began these books on the Trinity ... and I am now an old man as I publish them." English translation by E. Hill, 63.

<sup>195</sup> See *Retract.* II,15,1: *CCL* 57, 101. According to J. Plagnieux, the final redaction of *De Trinitate* (419) and also the completion of the work (books XIII–XV) were presumably directly influenced by the anti-Pelagian controversy (see J. Plagnieux, "Influence de la lutte anti-pélagienne sur le *De trinitate* ou Christocentrisme de Saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus Magister*, II, 817–826). The difficulty concerning the datation of the individual books of *De Trinitate* is discussed by A.-M. La Bonnardière: according to her analyses, books XIIb–XIV and XV were written after 417 and as late as between 420 and 426, respectively (see A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 165–169). On the contrary, E. Hendrikx holds that the whole work in its primordial version ("texte-brouillon") was ready as early as 405 and went through a kind of final redaction between 418 and 419 (see E. Hendrikx, "La date de composition du *De Trinitate* de saint Augustin", in: *L'année théologique augustinienne*, 12, 1952, 305–316). P.-M. Hombert maintains that only the first book may be dated to the period 400–403, dating the rest of the work (books II–XV) to after 411 (or, more precisely, he argues that books II–IV were written between 411 and 414); see P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches*, 43–80 (for the overview of older datations, see *ibid.* 8).

<sup>196</sup> On this work, see M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Münster 1927; J.E. Sullivan, *The Image of God*; A. Schindler, *Wort und Analogie*; J. Brachten-dorf, *Die Struktur*; *idem* (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild*.

<sup>197</sup> On Augustine's older conception of the image of God in man, see above, chap. I.2.1; I.3.2.

<sup>198</sup> See *De Trin.* XII,7,12: *CCL* 50, 367, where it is said that the image of God is in the human mind (*mens*), in the part which beholds the eternal reasons (*rationes aeternae*) of things. On other levels (e.g. in the external vision or imagination) Augustine finds only some kind of likeness (*similitudo*) of the Trinity (see *De Trin.* XI,5,8: *CCL* 50, 344). The conviction that the image of God is in the human mind (*mens*), i.e., in the intellect (*intellectus*), appears in other

actually imitates. Man is surely not a fully-fledged image of God which gives an entirely true picture of the archetype—as only Christ is such an image—but was made “to the image” (*ad imaginem*, cf. Gen. 1:26–27); in other words, it is not an altogether “equal image”, but a mere “likeness” (*similitudo*), for it approaches God by likeness (*similitudo*) and withdraws from God by unlikeness (*dissimilitudo*).<sup>199</sup> Nevertheless, Augustine explicitly rejects the idea that man was only created “after the image” of Christ, the true Image.<sup>200</sup> Men were created after the image of the whole Trinity, and that is why one can find in their minds a reflection of the consubstantiality, relationality and perichoresis of the divine persons.<sup>201</sup> Initially, Augustine finds the image in the double relationship of the mind to itself (i.e., in the way it knows itself and loves itself, as the mind is both this love and knowledge; the trinity of *mens*—*notitia*—*amor* in the ninth book),<sup>202</sup> later in the perichoresis of the memory, understanding and will (each of which, both separately and as a whole, represents the mind; the ternary of *memoria*—*intellectus*—*voluntas* in the tenth book).<sup>203</sup>

However, the next-to-last book, the fourteenth, presumably written after a break, shows that the image of God, corrupted as a result of human sin, can only be renewed after the mind has turned to God,<sup>204</sup> and that even in its trinities the human mind is the image of God not only because of its self-reflection or perichoretic substantial unity of its aspects, but, above all, because it can always turn to God again.<sup>205</sup> In this respect, the image of God (as even the fourteenth book has it) remains in the soul burdened with sin as well, though “faint and distorted” (*obscura atque deformis*).<sup>206</sup> Although the soul loses the actual participation in God, it is always capable of regaining

---

works by Augustine as well (see e.g. *In Ioh.* 3,4: CCL 36, 22; *In Ep. Ioh.* 8,6: SC 75, 350); in some places he also mentions *ratio* and *intellegentia* (see *De Gen. litt.* III,20,30: BA 48, 260) and *mens intellectualis* (*De Gen. litt.* VI,12,21: BA 48, 476) as equivalents.

<sup>199</sup> See *De Trin.* VII,6,12: CCL 50, 266. Similarly also *In Ep. Ioh.* 4,9: SC 75, 238.

<sup>200</sup> See *De Trin.* VII,6,12: CCL 50, 266 f.; *De Trin.* XII,6,7: CCL 50, 361 f.

<sup>201</sup> On this change in Augustine's notion of the image of God in man (which he was presumably preparing in *Confess.* XIII,11,12: CCL 27, 247 f.), see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 316–323.

<sup>202</sup> See *De Trin.* IX,3,3–5,8: CCL 50, 295–301.

<sup>203</sup> See *De Trin.* X,11,17–12,19: CCL 50, 329–332.

<sup>204</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,14,18: CCL 50A, 446.

<sup>205</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,12,15: CCL 50A, 442 f.

<sup>206</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,4,6: CCL 50A, 428. Although Augustine says in one of his works that the image of God was entirely “lost” as a result of sin (*De Gen. litt.* VI,27,38: BA 48, 504), it is an isolated statement and will be withdrawn later: the image was not lost, but deformed to such an extent that it needs to be renewed (see *Retract.* II,24,2: CCL 57, 110).



it (*eius* [*Dei*] *capax*).<sup>207</sup> It is by clinging to God (*ei inhaerere* or *adhaerere*), which enables it to partake of God's nature, that it achieves happiness.<sup>208</sup>

### 2.5b. *The Turning of the Will and the Gift of the Holy Spirit*

According to the eighth book of *De Trinitate*, the spiritual nature of the mind is perfected through the turning of the will (*conversio voluntatis*) to good, i.e., to God, who endowed it with the gift of being a mind. The spiritual nature that is given is thus brought to perfection by the human will:

So the good the soul turns to in order to be good is the good from which it gets its being soul at all. This is when the will accords with nature to perfect the soul in good, when the will turns (*conversione voluntatis*) in love toward that good by which the soul is what it does not forfeit being, even if the will turns away again. By turning away from the highest good the soul forfeits being a good soul; but it does not forfeit being soul, and even this is still a good that is better than the body. So the will can forfeit what the will can obtain.<sup>209</sup>

Augustine does not make a strict distinction between the image of God in the human mind and its completion through the movement of conversion; it rather seems that man becomes the true image of God in the act of acquiring a likeness to God, i.e., in knowing him: "... insofar as we know God we are like him, but never like him to the point of equality, since we never know him as much as he himself does."<sup>210</sup> Thus there is not a clear boundary between the mind of man and its voluntary completion, but a kind of continuity: it is as the image of God that men turn towards God in order to fulfil their being a mind:

<sup>207</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,8,11: CCL 50A, 436.

<sup>208</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,14,20: CCL 50A, 448. The ideas in book XIV have become the point of departure of M. Marrocco, who aims to show the whole treatise of *De Trinitate* as a process of the divinisation of man, or, in other words, as a process of the contemplation of the human soul as the image of God, and thus of God himself, of whom the soul is an image (see M. Marrocco, "Participation in Divine Life in the *De trinitate* of St. Augustine", in: *Augustinianum*, 42, 2002, 182).

<sup>209</sup> *Ad hoc se igitur animus convertit ut bonus sit a quo habet ut animus sit. Tunc ergo voluntas naturae congruit ut perficiatur in bono animus cum illud bonum diligitur conversione voluntatis unde est et illud quod non amittitur nec aversione voluntatis. Avertendo enim se a summo bono amittit animus ut sit bonus animus; non autem amittit ut sit animus cum et hoc iam bonum sit corpore melius. Hoc ergo amittit voluntas quod voluntas adipiscitur* (*De Trin.* VIII,3,5: CCL 50, 274). English translation by E. Hill, 245. Augustine elaborated in much greater detail on the notion of the conversion to the creator, which brings a form, with respect to angelic beings; see *De Gen. litt.* I,4,9–5,10: BA 48, 90–94.

<sup>210</sup> *Quocirca in quantum Deum novimus similes sumus, sed non ad aequalitatem similes quia nec tantum eum novimus quantum ipse se* (*De Trin.* IX,11,16: CCL 50, 307). English translation after E. Hill, 279f.

... [M]an is said to be *to the image* (cf. Gen. 1:26–27) because of the disparity of his likeness to God ...; not equal to the trinity as the Son is equal to the Father, but approaching it ... by a certain likeness, as one can talk of a certain proximity between things distant from each other, not proximity of place but of a sort of imitation. To this kind of approximation we are exhorted when it says, *Be refashioned in the newness of your mind* (Rom. 12:2), and elsewhere he says, *Be therefore imitators of God as most dear sons* (Eph. 5:1), for it is with reference to the new man that it says, *Who is being renewed for the recognition of God according to the image of him who created him* (Col. 3:10).<sup>211</sup>

In the fifth book of *De Trinitate*, this spiritual nature of man (*spiritus hominis*) as the gift of being (*ut essemus*) is differentiated from the sanctifying gift of the Holy Spirit (*ut sancti essemus*).<sup>212</sup> The Holy Spirit, perceived as a personification of the consubstantial love between the Father and Son<sup>213</sup> (or their communion, friendship, holiness or unity),<sup>214</sup> joins together men and God,<sup>215</sup> with whom they are never identical, but in whom they can participate because of the incarnation of the Word, by whom all things were made.<sup>216</sup> The Spirit is thus a special gift of God's presence in man or human

<sup>211</sup> *Sed propter imparem ... similitudinem dictus est homo ad imaginem, ... non trinitati aequalis sicut filius patri, sed accedens ... quadam similitudine sicut in distantibus significatur quaedam vicinitas non loci sed cuiusdam imitationis. Ad hoc enim et dicitur: Reformamini in novitate mentis vestrae; quibus item dicit: Estote itaque imitatores Dei sicut filii dilectissimi. Novo enim homini dicitur: Qui renovatur in agnitionem Dei secundum imaginem eius qui creavit eum* (*De Trin.* VII,6,12: CCL 50, 267). English translation by E. Hill, 231f. See also *De Trin.* IX,11,16: CCL 50, 307. However, J. Brachtendorf infers from the passage in *De Trin.* XII,11,16: CCL 50, 370 that Augustine did make a distinction between the "image of God" as the imperishable core of the human mind structured in a trinitarian way and the "likeness of God" as an ethical quality of life, which may appear in various degrees and may even be lost entirely (see J. Brachtendorf, *Die Struktur*, 204 ff.). On the other hand, the passage in question does not make such an explicit distinction; Augustine rather seems to regard the "likeness" of man to animals (following Ps. 48[49]:13) as a departure both from the image of God and the likeness.

<sup>212</sup> See *De Trin.* V,14,15: CCL 50, 223. In his sermons on the Gospel of John, Augustine even explicitly mentions "nature" and "grace": *seorsum est gratia Dei, seorsum natura hominis* (*In Joh.* 14,6: CCL 36, 144).

<sup>213</sup> See *De Trin.* VI,5,7: CCL 50, 235. The notion of the Holy Spirit as personified Love (at the same time, however, God is love in his essence) is elaborated on in the last book of Augustine's treatise with respect to the way in which the Holy Spirit influences the hearts of men. The Holy Spirit, who endows men with love, is God-Love *proprie*, i.e., consubstantial Love between the Father and Son, and therefore also a form of God's presence in man (see *De Trin.* XV,17,27–27,50: CCL 50A, 501–533). On this passage, see B. Studer, "Zur Pneumatologie des Augustinus von Hippo (*De Trinitate* 15,17,27–27,50)", in: *Augustinianum*, 35, 1995, 567–583.

<sup>214</sup> See *De Trin.* VI,5,7: CCL 50, 235; on the "communion", see also *De Trin.* V,11,12: CCL 50, 219f.

<sup>215</sup> See *De Trin.* VII,3,6: CCL 50, 254.

<sup>216</sup> See *De Trin.* IV,2,4: CCL 50, 163f.

participation in God, mediated through the incarnation of Christ. That is why the Spirit is also called a “Gift”: it is a gift of the Father and Son<sup>217</sup> in which God gives himself to man,<sup>218</sup> the gift of love.<sup>219</sup>

In the fifth book of his treatise Augustine concludes that the Spirit, given in time (*temporaliter donatum*), is a gift of the Father and Son from eternity (*sempiternae donum*), though one not dependent on the addressee of the gift.<sup>220</sup> However, in the fifteenth and last book Augustine says that the Spirit, which is from eternity God-Love consubstantial with the Father and Son, is a gift only because he has been given to men and endows them with gifts; in other words, the Spirit becomes a Gift only on the grounds of his “mission”.<sup>221</sup>

In any case, Augustine maintains that God is not a Trinity because he gives himself to men, but because he in himself is relationality and sharing of love,<sup>222</sup> in which men also participate through their love (*caritas, dilectio*) of God and of other people.<sup>223</sup> At the same time, God is not changed by men turning towards him: he is in them for ever, being even “more inwardly” present than “their own inwardness”.<sup>224</sup> By the same token, God is not changed (in a substantial or accidental way) by becoming the Father of adoptive sons. Such a change can only be said of God in relation to the man who changes (*relative*).<sup>225</sup>

<sup>217</sup> See *De Trin.* IV,20,29; CCL 50, 199f.; *De Trin.* V,11,12–12,13; CCL 50, 219f.; *De Trin.* V,14,15; CCL 50, 222f.; *De Trin.* XV,19,36; CCL 50A, 512f.

<sup>218</sup> See *De Trin.* XV,19,36; CCL 50A, 513.

<sup>219</sup> *Sanctus itaque spiritus de quo dedit nobis facit nos in Deo manere et ipsum in nobis. Hoc autem facit dilectio. Ipse est igitur Deus dilectio. ... Deus igitur spiritus sanctus qui procedit ex Deo cum datus fuerit homini accendit eum in dilectionem Dei et proximi, et ipse dilectio est. Non enim habet homo unde Deum diligat nisi ex Deo. ... Nec spiritus proprie dicitur donum nisi propter dilectionem ... Dilectio igitur quae ex Deo est et Deus est proprie spiritus sanctus est per quem diffunditur in cordibus nostris Dei caritas (Rom. 5:5) per quam nos tota inhabitet trinitas. Quocirca rectissime spiritus sanctus, cum sit Deus, vocatur etiam donum Dei. Quod donum proprie quid nisi caritas intellegenda est quae perducit ad Deum et sine qua quodlibet aliud Dei donum non perducit ad Deum? (De Trin. XV,17,31–18,32; CCL 50A, 506–508).*

<sup>220</sup> See *De Trin.* V,15,16–16,17; CCL 50, 224f.

<sup>221</sup> See *De Trin.* XV,19,36; CCL 50A, 513. On this change, see M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre*, 396–398; J. Arnold, “Begriff und heilsökonomische Bedeutung der göttlichen Sendungen in Augustinus’ *De Trinitate*”, in: *RechAuch* 25, 1991, 63ff. On the relationship between the proceeding of the Spirit (*processio*) in God and the mission of the Holy Spirit in the history of salvation (*missio*), see J. Arnold, “Begriff”, 24–30.

<sup>222</sup> See *De Trin.* XV,19,36; CCL 50A, 513.

<sup>223</sup> See *De Trin.* VIII,8,12; CCL 50, 286–288.

<sup>224</sup> ... interiora sua ..., quibus interior est Deus (*De Trin.* VIII,7,11; CCL 50, 285).

<sup>225</sup> See *De Trin.* V,16,17; CCL 50, 226f.

As Augustine has it in the fourteenth book, the image of God in the rational soul, which is to be renewed “according to God” (cf. Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10),<sup>226</sup> can only be renewed by God himself. Man managed to deform it (*deformare*), but he is not capable of forming it anew (*reformare*):

Those who do, on being reminded, turn to the Lord (cf. Ps. 21:28 [22:28]) from the deformity which had conformed them by worldly lusts to this world are reformed by him ... And thus the image begins to be reformed by him who formed it in the first place. It cannot reform itself in the way it was able to deform itself.<sup>227</sup>

This, according to Augustine, is a transformation “from glory to glory” (2 Cor. 3:18), i.e., from the “glory of creation to the glory of justification”, which can only be realised through grace, through the influence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>228</sup> As we can see, the original concept of a voluntary conversion which makes the image of God complete changes in the fourteenth book into a renewal of a deformed image which can only be realised through the intervention of grace.

### 2.5c. *The Gratuity of Grace and Human Merits*

As Augustine points out in the fourteenth book, turning towards God and participation in him are given to men as a reward (*praemium*) for their merits (*meritum*). After the fall, however, men are not capable of achieving such a merit and can only gain it through grace (Augustine quotes 1 Cor. 4:7

<sup>226</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,16,22: CCL 50A, 453f.

<sup>227</sup> *Qui vero commemorati convertuntur ad dominum ab ea deformitate qua per cupiditates saeculares conformabantur huic saeculo reformantur ex illo, ... ut incipiat illa imago ab illo reformari a quo formata est. Non enim reformare se ipsam potest, sicut potuit deformare (De Trin. XIV,16,22: CCL 50A, 451).* English translation by E. Hill, 388. Similarly also *De Gen. litt.* VI,27,38: BA 48, 504, where the renewal of the image lost as a result of sin is attributed to the justifying grace (*per gratiam iustitiae*). In another passage Augustine says that the Christians are to be renewed after the “image of God”, as they were made men after the same image (see *In Ioh.* 5,12: CCL 36, 47). It is also said that the renewal is meant in the Christological way: the new formation can only be performed by the “natural” Son of God, the Word, by whom man was made after the image of God at the beginning; the Son of God is both the *formator* and *reformer* of the image of God in man (*Enarr. Psalm.* 32(2),2,16: CCL 38, 266); it is due to God, who became man, that men, made after the image of God at the very beginning, can become sons of God, similar to God in full (*Enarr. Psalm.* 32(2),1,4: CCL 38, 249).

<sup>228</sup> ... *de gloria creationis in gloriam iustificationis. ... Quod vero adiunxit, tamquam a domini spiritu (2 Cor. 3:18), ostendit gratia Dei nobis conferri tam optabilis transformationis bonum (De Trin. XV,8,14: CCL 50A, 480).*

again: “And what do you have that you did not receive?”).<sup>229</sup> Grace (*gratia*) is thus given *gratis*, for it is not given according to previous merits. It is bestowed by God not because some are worthy of it, but because he himself wants it so. In this respect, grace is presumably meant mainly as a barrier against pride.<sup>230</sup>

A similar emphasis on the freely given grace can also be found in the thirteenth book, in Augustine’s account of the sonship of God given to men. The power to become the children of God through faith, i.e., not to be born on account of the human will, but from God (cf. John 1:12–13), can only be given to men because of the one who is “by nature” the Son of God. He was made the Son of man through mercy for the sake of the children of men so that they could, through grace, become the sons of God. Just as the Son of God dwelt among men (*habitavit in hominibus*; cf. John 1:14), so the children of men may dwell in God (*habitare in Deo*). Because of his participation in human mortality, men can attain immortality:

For surely if the Son of God by nature became son of man by mercy for the sake of the sons of men ..., how much easier it is to believe that the sons of men by nature can become sons of God by grace and dwell in God; for it is in him alone and thanks to him alone that they can be happy, by sharing in his immortality; it was to persuade us of this that the Son of God came to share in our mortality.<sup>231</sup>

This idea appears in a similar way in the fifth book;<sup>232</sup> in the thirteenth it is joined by another motif: the descending of God is even more radical, says Augustine, given the fact that it is concerned not only with the disproportion of natures but “merits” as well. The Son of God entered into his fellowship with men without any evil merit (*malum meritum*) of his own;

---

<sup>229</sup> See *De Trin.* XIV,15,21: CCL 50A, 449. V.H. Drecoll also sees a connection between Augustine’s notion of the Spirit as love and the affective-pneumatological doctrine of grace in the way it was elaborated by Augustine in his *De spiritu et littera* at approximately the same time (see V.H. Drecoll, “*Mens—notitia—amor*”).

<sup>230</sup> ... *gratiam ... non meritis redditam sed gratis datam unde et gratia nominatur; dedit enim eam non quia digni eramus sed quia voluit. Hoc cognoscentes non fidentes in nobis erimus, et hoc est infirmari* (*De Trin.* IV,1,2: CCL 50, 161). According to A.-M. La Bonnardière, the introduction to the fourth book of *De Trinitate* was probably written after 418 as an amendment during the process of redaction (see A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 173).

<sup>231</sup> *Si enim natura Dei filius propter filios hominum misericordia factus est hominis filius ..., quanto est credibilius natura filios hominis gratia Dei fieri Dei filios et habitare in Deo in quo solo et de quo solo esse possint beati participes immortalitatis eius effecti, propter quod persuadendum Dei filius particeps nostrae mortalitatis effectus est?* (*De Trin.* XIII,9,12: CCL 50A, 399). English translation by E. Hill, 353.

<sup>232</sup> See *De Trin.* V,14,15: CCL 50, 222.

on the contrary, men are endowed with all divine gifts without any previous merits (*bona merita*), or rather, notwithstanding their evil merits (*mala merita*). Even what we call human merits, i.e., acts of love, are in fact divine gifts, bestowed through the influence of the Holy Spirit:

... [The Son of God] should first of all endure our ills without any ill deserts of his own (*malo suo merito*); and then once we had been brought in this way to believe how much God loved us and to hope at last for what we had despaired of, should confer his gifts on us with a quite uncalled for generosity, without any good deserts of ours (*sine ullis bonis meritis nostris*), indeed with our ill deserts our only preparation? For even what we call our deserts or merits (*merita nostra*) are gifts of his. In order that faith might work through love (Gal. 5:6), *the charity of God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us* (Rom. 5:5). ... These gifts are merits by which we arrive at the supreme good of immortal happiness.<sup>233</sup>

In his treatise *De Trinitate*, Augustine regards grace (the gift of the Spirit or Love) as something transcending the human mind; he even mentions God's plan of predestination concerned with "his saints".<sup>234</sup> Despite the fact that Augustine does not explicitly deal with the theme of grace in *De Trinitate*, one can find here not only the distinction between the nature of the human mind on one hand and the gift of the Holy Spirit as divine love working in the hearts of men on the other, but also (especially in the later parts of the treatise) several references to the freely given gift.<sup>235</sup> The original concept of the image of God bestowed in the human mind and fulfilled

<sup>233</sup> ... *prius sine ullo malo suo merito mala nostra perferret, ac sic iam credentibus quantum nos diligit Deus et quod desperabamus iam sperantibus dona in nos sua sine ullis bonis meritis nostris, immo praecedentibus et malis meritis nostris, indebita largitate conferret? Quia et ea quae dicuntur merita nostra dona sunt eius. Ut enim fides per dilectionem operetur, caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis. ... Haec dona sunt merita nostra quibus ad summum bonum immortalis beatitudinis pervenimus* (*De Trin.* XIII,10,13–14; CCL 50A, 400). English translation by E. Hill, 354.

<sup>234</sup> *Quod ergo temporaliter dici incipit Deus quod antea non dicebatur manifestum est relative dici, non tamen secundum accidens Dei quod ei aliquid acciderit, sed plane secundum accidens eius ad quod dici aliquid Deus incipit relative. ... Itaque omnes sanctos suos ante mundi constitutionem dilexit sicut praedestinavit* (cf. Eph. 1:4; John 17:24), *sed cum convertuntur et inveniunt illum, tunc incipere ab eo diligi dicuntur ut eo modo dicatur quo potest humano affectu capi quod dicitur* (*De Trin.* V,16,17; CCL 50, 227). See also *De Trin.* XIII,16,20; CCL 50A, 409f.

<sup>235</sup> For the pneumatological amendments in the later passages of Augustine's work, presumably influenced by his doctrine of grace, see L. Karfíková, "Merita nostra dona sunt eius. Die Pneumatologie und Gnadenehre nach Augustin von Hippo, *De Trinitate*", in: Y. de Andia—P.L. Hofrichter (eds.), *Der Heilige Geist im Leben der Kirche*, Innsbruck—Wien 2005, 217–228.

in the conversion of the will changes in the course of the treatise into a doctrine on an image corrupted by sin and renewed by freely given grace.

## 2.6. *Attractio voluptatis* (*Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium 17–124*)

Augustine's doctrine on grace had a marked influence on the interpretation of the Gospel of John which appears in his sermons after 414.<sup>236</sup> These include several themes known from Augustine's other works. The duality of the law (which accuses one) and grace (which sets one free)<sup>237</sup> results in the emphasis on grace as love given by the Holy Spirit: only love can fulfil the law condensed into the twofold commandment of the love of God and the love of one's neighbour.<sup>238</sup> The latter is a way of reaching God, for the hidden God cannot be seen otherwise than through love.<sup>239</sup> Love is the distinctive feature of Christianity.<sup>240</sup> Those who lack love also lack faith (not vice versa); those who do not love believe in grace in vain.<sup>241</sup> Only one who loves has the gift of the Holy Spirit: the more he loves, the more he deserves the gift, and the more he has it, the more he loves.<sup>242</sup> And yet, we love because God himself first loved us (1 John 4:10). We thus do not deserve love by our acts, but we receive it as grace so that we might act.<sup>243</sup>

According to Augustine, love has a communal aspect as well. The gift of love is not only the love of God (without which, says Augustine, true love of man cannot exist<sup>244</sup>), but it is always love of the community of believers, of the church which makes up the body of Christ himself.<sup>245</sup> What belongs

<sup>236</sup> On the datation of these sermons, see above, chap. II.3, introduction, n. 8.

<sup>237</sup> See *In Ioh.* 17,2: CCL 36, 171; similarly also *In Ioh.* 122,8: CCL 36, 673.

<sup>238</sup> See *In Ioh.* 17,6: CCL 36, 173; similarly also *In Ioh.* 74,2: CCL 36, 513 f.

<sup>239</sup> See *In Ioh.* 17,8: CCL 36, 174 f.

<sup>240</sup> See *In Ioh.* 65,3: CCL 36, 492.

<sup>241</sup> *Daemon credit* (James 2:19), *nec diligit; nemo diligit, qui non credit. Frustra quidem, sed tamen potest sperare veniam qui non diligit; nemo autem potest desperare qui diligit. Itaque ubi dilectio est, ibi necessario fides et spes; et ubi dilectio proximi, ibi necessario etiam dilectio Dei* (*In Ioh.* 83,3: CCL 36, 536).

<sup>242</sup> *Restat ergo ut intellegamus Spiritum sanctum habere qui diligit, et habendo mereri ut plus habeat, et plus habendo plus diligit* (*In Ioh.* 74,2: CCL 36, 513).

<sup>243</sup> *Dilectio facit praecepta servari, an praecepta servata faciunt dilectionem? Sed quis ambigat quod dilectio praecedit? Unde enim praecepta servet non habet, qui non diligit. ... Non ergo ut nos diligit, prius eius praecepta servamus; sed nisi nos diligit, praecepta eius servare non possumus. Haec est gratia quae humilibus patet, superbos latet* (*In Ioh.* 82,3: CCL 36, 533). Similarly also *In Ioh.* 102,5: CCL 36, 597.

<sup>244</sup> See *In Ioh.* 83,3: CCL 36, 536.

<sup>245</sup> See *In Ioh.* 21,7–8: CCL 36, 216.

to one in this fellowship also belongs to all: he who has love has all the gifts which have been bestowed upon the others.<sup>246</sup>

It is through love (*amor*) as a “pleasure of the heart” or “of the mind” (*voluptas cordis* or *animi*) that God draws men to himself (cf. John 6:44). Just as a sheep is attracted by a green twig and a boy is attracted by nuts, God attracts men by love, a “chain of the heart”. *Trahit sua quemque voluptas* (“his own pleasure draws each man”), as Augustine learnt from Vergil:

*No one comes to me except whom the Father draws* (John 6:44). Do not think that you are drawn unwillingly (*invitum*); the mind is drawn also by love. ... How do I believe by will, if I am drawn? I say, it is not enough by will (*voluntate*), you are also drawn by pleasure (*voluptate*). What does it mean to be drawn by pleasure? *Take delight in the Lord, and he will grant you your heart's requests* (Ps. 36[37]:4). There is a certain pleasure of the heart to which that heavenly [bread] is sweet bread. ... You show a green branch to a sheep and you draw her. Nuts are shown to a boy and he is drawn. And he is drawn by what he runs to, by loving he is drawn, without injury to the body he is drawn, by a chain of the heart (*cordis vinculo*) he is drawn. Therefore, if those things which amid earthly delights and pleasures are revealed to those who love them draw them, because it is true that *his own pleasure draws each man* (Vergil, *Ecl.* II,65), does not Christ, revealed by the Father, draw?<sup>247</sup>

The “attraction” (*adtractio*) thus does not consist in an obligation, but in drawing by means of delight (*non obligatio, sed delectatio*).<sup>248</sup> Moreover, it is a movement of the will (*volens*), for nobody believes unless he is willing,<sup>249</sup> although it remains a mystery who God will draw and why he draws one and not another.<sup>250</sup>

<sup>246</sup> *Multa enim dantur ad manifestationem, sed tu forsitan eorum omnium quae dixi nihil habes. Si amas, non nihil habes: si enim amas unitatem, etiam tibi habet quisquis in illa habet aliquid. Tolle invidiam, et tuum est quod habeo; tollam invidiam, et meum est quod habes* (In Ioh. 32,8: CCL 36, 304). Similarly also In Ioh. 67,2: CCL 36, 496.

<sup>247</sup> *Nemo venit ad me, nisi quem Pater attraxerit. Noli te cogitare invitum trahi; trahitur animus et amore. ... Quomodo voluntate credo, si trahor? Ego dico: parum est voluntate, etiam voluptate traheris. Quid est trahi voluptate? Delectare in Domino, et dabit tibi petitiones cordis tui. Est quaedam voluptas cordis, cui panis dulcis est ille caelestis. ... Ramum viridem ostendis ovi, et trahis illam. Nuces puero demonstrantur, et trahitur; et quo currit trahitur, amando trahitur, sine laesione corporis trahitur, cordis vinculo trahitur. Si ergo ista quae inter delicias et voluptates terrenas revelantur amantibus, trahunt, quoniam verum est, “Trahit sua quemque voluptas”; non trahit revelatus Christus a Patre? (In Ioh. 26,4–5: CCL 36, 261f.). English translation by J.W. Rettig, 262–264.*

<sup>248</sup> In Ioh. 26,4: CCL 36, 261.

<sup>249</sup> *Non enim ad Christum ambulando currimus, sed credendo; nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus* (In Ioh. 26,3: CCL 36, 261).

<sup>250</sup> ... *nemo potest venire ad me, nisi Pater qui misit me, traxerit eum* (John 6:44). *Magna gratiae commendatio! Nemo venit nisi tractus. Quem trahat et quem non trahat, quare illum*



At the same time, this attraction is an intellectual movement concerned with a delight in the truth.<sup>251</sup> God draws men by teaching them in their hearts as the “inner Master” (*magister interior*)<sup>252</sup> and thus evokes their delight (*docendo delectat*).<sup>253</sup> It is by the affective movement of love (*veniamus affectibus ... amando veniamus*) that men come to Christ:<sup>254</sup> they turn and run towards God “not with feet but with affections” (*non pedibus, sed affectibus curris*).<sup>255</sup> Through love, which the Holy Spirit pours out into the hearts of men “ever more and more largely” (*magis magisque*), men are taught “all truth” (cf. Rom. 5:5; John 16:13).<sup>256</sup>

As Augustine has it, faith (*credere in*) is a movement of love, which is directed towards what it loves. It is this voluntary movement which God asks of men; they, however, are not capable of it unless they are endowed with it.<sup>257</sup> All in all, this is the mystery of God’s inscrutable predestination, which was decided on in eternity and which is realised in time (*Fecit ergo ea praedestinando, facturum est operando*).<sup>258</sup> Each man is “working out” his own salvation, being a “co-worker” in it, and yet it is actually Christ who works in him (though not without him).<sup>259</sup> It would thus be wrong to say that God only created men, but they become righteous on their own. Without Christ as the vine, in whom men abide as branches, we “can do nothing” (cf. John 15:5).<sup>260</sup> The man, therefore, who thinks that he becomes righteous not by the

---

*trahat et illum non trahat, noli velle iudicare, si non vis errare. Semel accipe, et intellege ... (In Ioh. 26,2: CCL 36, 260f.).*

<sup>251</sup> ... quanto fortius nos dicere debemus trahi hominem ad Christum, qui delectatur veritate, delectatur beatitudine, delectatur iustitia, delectatur sempiterna vita, quod totum Christus est? ... Quid enim fortius desiderat anima quam veritatem? Quo avidas fauces habere debet, unde optare ut sanum sit intus palatum vera iudicandi, nisi ut manducet et bibat sapientiam, iustitiam, veritatem, aeternitatem? (In Ioh. 26,4–5: CCL 36, 261f.).

<sup>252</sup> On the notion of Christ as an “inner Master”, see *In Ioh.* 20,3: CCL 36, 204; *In Ioh.* 96,4: CCL 36, 571; *In Ioh.* 97,1: CCL 36, 573.

<sup>253</sup> *Nisi ergo revelet ille qui intus est, quid dico, aut quid loquor? ... Videte quomodo trahit Pater: docendo delectat, non necessitatem imponendo. Ecce quomodo trahit (In Ioh. 26,7: CCL 36, 263).*

<sup>254</sup> See *In Ioh.* 32,1: CCL 36, 300.

<sup>255</sup> See *In Ioh.* 36,8: CCL 36, 329.

<sup>256</sup> See *In Ioh.* 96,5: CCL 36, 572.

<sup>257</sup> *Quid est ergo credere in eum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, et eius membris incorporari. Ipsa est ergo fides quam de nobis exigit Deus; et non invenit quod exigit, nisi donaverit quod inveniat (In Ioh. 29,6: CCL 36, 287).*

<sup>258</sup> *In Ioh.* 68,1: CCL 36, 497. On predestination, see also *In Ioh.* 26,15: CCL 36, 267; *In Ioh.* 42,16: CCL 36, 373; *In Ioh.* 45,12–14: CCL 36, 394–396; *In Ioh.* 83,1: CCL 36, 534f.

<sup>259</sup> *Quod utique in illo, sed non sine illo Christus operatur (In Ioh. 72,3: CCL 36, 508).*

<sup>260</sup> See *In Ioh.* 81,2: CCL 36, 530.

grace of God, but by his own will, is “righteous over-much” (*iustus multum*; cf. Eccles. 7:17).<sup>261</sup> We surely are evil of ourselves, but we are good of God and through him (*ab illo et per illum*).<sup>262</sup>

In Augustine’s opinion, it is (paradoxically) in this awareness of dependence that the difference between a servant and a son consists: a servant, unlike a son, “does not know what his master is doing” (John 15:15); he does not know that what is good in him is worked by his master and that he cannot boast. On the other hand, the fear of the son, unlike the slavish fear, knows that he has no merits of his own.<sup>263</sup> It is an attitude of love which loves *gratis*, for the sake of the love, not for the sake of a reward.<sup>264</sup> Turning away from the attitude aimed at one’s own righteousness (i.e., from the attitude of “pride”) is also grace, and, as Augustine maintains, even grace in the proper sense.<sup>265</sup> Therefore, those who think that the life and death of Christ is only an example (*exemplum*) which men can imitate on their own are actually diminishing salvation and misinterpreting grace.<sup>266</sup>

As far as the dependence of men on God is concerned, there are two extremes which are to be avoided, says Augustine: pride (*superbia*) and carelessness (*negligentia*). It would be a mistake to suppose that faith and a good life depend entirely on the free choice of the will without divine assistance. At the same time, it would be erroneous to conclude that it is therefore useless and futile for a man to make any effort on his own, arguing that all depends on God,<sup>267</sup> or even maintain that God “blinds” the hearts of men and thus leads men to sin. God foreknows the unfaithfulness, i.e., the

<sup>261</sup> See *In Ioh.* 95,2: CCL 36, 565 f.

<sup>262</sup> See *In Ioh.* 43,1: CCL 36, 373.

<sup>263</sup> See *In Ioh.* 85,3: CCL 36, 539 f. On the themes of a servile, slavish fear (*timor servilis*) and a clean, chaste fear (*timor castus*), see also *In Ioh.* 43,7: CCL 36, 375.

<sup>264</sup> See *In Ioh.* 51,11: CCL 36, 443 f.; similarly also *In Ioh.* 25,10: CCL 36, 252; *In Ioh.* 91,4: CCL 36, 555; *In Ioh.* 46,5: CCL 36, 400.

<sup>265</sup> *Et ipsa enim conversio de illius gratia est, cui dicitur: Deus virtutum, converte nos* (Ps. 79[80]:8). *An forte et hoc de supernae medicinae misericordia factum intellegendum est, ut quoniam superbae et perversae voluntatis erant, et suam iustitiam constituere volebant, ad hoc desererentur, ut excaecarentur; ad hoc excaecarentur, ut offenderent in lapidem offensionis, et impleretur facies eorum ignominia, atque ita humiliati quaererent nomen Domini, et non suam qua inflatur superbus, sed iustitiam Dei qua iustificatur impius?* (*In Ioh.* 53,11: CCL 36, 457). Similarly also *In Ioh.* 81,2: CCL 36, 530.

<sup>266</sup> *Animalis enim homo ... non percipit quae sunt Spiritus Dei* (1 Cor. 2:14), *id est, quid gratiae creditibus crux conferat Christi, et putat hoc illa cruce actum esse tantummodo, ut nobis usque ad mortem pro veritate certantibus imitandum praeberetur exemplum* (*In Ioh.* 98,3: CCL 36, 578).

<sup>267</sup> See *In Ioh.* 53,8: CCL 36, 455 f.

“depraved will” of some men, but does not cause it.<sup>268</sup> On the other hand, without his aid it is impossible to have a good will. It cannot be said why God enlightens one and not another and why he aids one and not another. It is a hidden judgement, although not “one that is unrighteous,” Augustine says reassuringly.<sup>269</sup> We are either “deservedly (*per meritum*) forsaken by divine help or aided through grace (*per gratiam*).”<sup>270</sup> One cannot think that God merely foreknows our merits and our faith and chooses us because of them, for this would mean putting the foreknowledge of God against his grace and denying that we have not chosen him, but he has chosen us (cf. John 15:16).<sup>271</sup> The grace bestowed on men is in accord with the purpose of the one who calls, not of those who are called (*propositum vocantis, non vocatorum*).<sup>272</sup> Should we be chosen because of our merits, then it is no longer “the election of grace” (*electio gratiae*), and grace is no longer grace.<sup>273</sup>

Augustine explicitly makes it clear that some are “predestined to destruction” (*ad interitum praedestinati*), while others have been delivered by the sacrifice of Christ and given eternal life:

*And they shall not perish forever* (John 10:28). You hear the implication, as if he said to them, You will perish forever because you are not of my sheep. *No one shall snatch them out of my hand* (ibid.). Receive it more attentively. *What my Father has given me is greater than all* (cf. John 10:29). What can the wolf do? What can the thief and the robber do? They only destroy those predestined to destruction (*ad interitum praedestinos*).<sup>274</sup>

And here he shows that he indeed has received power over every man (cf. John 17:2), so that he who will judge the living and the dead may set free whom he would, may damn whom he would (*damnet quos voluerit*) ...<sup>275</sup>

<sup>268</sup> See *In Ioh.* 53,4–6: CCL 36, 453–455.

<sup>269</sup> *Sic enim excaecat, sic obdurat Deus, deserendo et non adiuvando; quod occulto iudicio facere potest, iniquo non potest. Hoc omnino pietas religiosorum inconcussum debet inviolatunque servare ... Ideo cum quaestiones huiusmodi in medium venerint, quare alius sic, alius autem sic; quare ille Deo deserente excaecetur, ille Deo adiuvante illuminetur, non nobis iudicium de iudicio tanti iudicis usurpemus, sed contremiscentes exclamemus cum apostolo: O altitudo divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei!* (Rom. 11:33) (*In Ioh.* 53,6: CCL 36, 454f.).

<sup>270</sup> See *In Ioh.* 55,4: CCL 36, 645.

<sup>271</sup> See *In Ioh.* 86,2: CCL 36, 542.

<sup>272</sup> See *In Ioh.* 115,4: CCL 36, 645.

<sup>273</sup> See *In Ioh.* 86,2: CCL 36, 542; similarly also *In Ioh.* 87,3: CCL 36, 545.

<sup>274</sup> *Et non peribunt in aeternum; subaudis, tamquam eis dixerit: Vos peribitis in aeternum, quia non estis ex ovibus meis. Non rapiet eas quisquam de manu mea. Intentius accipite: Pater meus quod dedit mihi, maius est omnibus. Quid potest lupus? quid potest fur et latro? Non perdunt nisi ad interitum praedestinos* (*In Ioh.* 48,6: CCL 36, 415). English translation by J.W. Rettig, 231f.

<sup>275</sup> *Ubi ostendit potestatem se quidem omnis hominis accepisse, ut liberet quos voluerit,*

Only the latter are, again through his mediation as the Son of God, adopted as the sons of God, and through grace they will participate in divinity (*participando fiunt dii*).<sup>276</sup> They were endowed with the “power to become the sons of God” (John 1:12). As follows from Augustine’s account, this evangelical expression encapsulates the uneven proportion between the divine and human initiatives in the process of salvation and deification.<sup>277</sup> For man, grace is always freely given; it is an unfathomable destiny, a “lot” that is cast (*sors*). Those who are not endowed with it are bound to live “according to the lust of the world”:

He now wishes the world to be understood as those who live according to the lust of the world and who are not in that allotted portion of grace (*in ea sorte gratiae*) so that they may be chosen by him out of the world.<sup>278</sup>

In the lot (cf. John 19:24), moreover, what has been commended except the grace of God? For indeed in this way in one it comes to all, since the lot pleased all, because in unity the grace of God also comes to all; and when the lot is cast, one yields not to the person or merits of anyone but to the hidden judgment of God.<sup>279</sup>

Just as the destiny of the man Christ was foreordained ages ago,<sup>280</sup> it was also foreordained in whom the Son will be glorified (cf. John 17:10);<sup>281</sup> in the time of this world the plan is realised<sup>282</sup> through the working of God in the hearts of men, through the love of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, grace not only gives rise to the Christian existence in itself, but also to the specific gifts bestowed on believers. Thus the apostle Peter was by nature (*natura*) a man, by grace (*gratia*) a Christian, and by still more abounding grace (*abundantiore gratia*) the first apostle.<sup>283</sup>

---

*damnet quos voluerit, qui vivos et mortuos iudicabit* (*In Ioh.* 111,1: CCL 36, 628). English translation by J.W. Rettig, 300.

<sup>276</sup> See *In Ioh.* 48,9: CCL 36, 417 (to Ps. 81[82]:6). On the adoption of men as sons of God through the only-begotten Son, who became man, see also *In Ioh.* 21,1: CCL 36, 212; *In Ioh.* 21,3: CCL 36, 213; *In Ioh.* 54,2: CCL 36, 459.

<sup>277</sup> See *In Ioh.* 53,8: CCL 36, 456.

<sup>278</sup> *Mundum vult modo intellegi, qui vivunt secundum concupiscentiam mundi, et non sunt in ea sorte gratiae, ut ab illo eligantur ex mundo* (*In Ioh.* 107,1: CCL 36, 613). English translation by J.W. Rettig, 273.

<sup>279</sup> *In sorte autem quid, nisi Dei gratia commendata est? Sic quippe in uno ad omnes pervenit, cum sors omnibus placuit, quia et Dei gratia in unitate ad omnes pervenit; et cum sors mittitur, non personae cuiusque vel meritis, sed occulto iudicio Dei ceditur* (*In Ioh.* 118,4: CCL 36, 657). English translation by J.W. Rettig, 42 f. Similarly also *Enarr. Psalm.* 30(2),2,13: CCL 38, 211.

<sup>280</sup> See *In Ioh.* 105,4–8: CCL 36, 605–608; *In Ioh.* 110,3: CCL 36, 623 f.

<sup>281</sup> See *In Ioh.* 107,3: CCL 36, 614.

<sup>282</sup> See *In Ioh.* 108,2: CCL 36, 607.

<sup>283</sup> See *In Ioh.* 124,5: CCL 36, 684.

Augustine's homilies on the Gospel of John present his doctrine of grace in full. Grace is mainly perceived here as love poured out into the hearts of men through the Holy Spirit. By this love God "draws" men to himself: he affects their wills and gradually leads them to the truth. However, who will be endowed with the affective "attraction" has been decided by the inscrutable judgement of divine predestination.

2.7. "Good Concupiscence"  
(Enarrationes in Psalmos 118)

A homiletic form of Augustine's doctrine on grace can also be found in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos* from the anti-Pelagian period. As an illustrative example we may use the exposition of the most extensive psalm, Psalm 118 (119), to which Augustine devoted thirty-two homilies in total.

Men are presented here as beings seeking happiness with their desires (*sua sponte appetit*) and wills, and yet not through their own choice (*velimus quod nolle non possumus*): the will to happiness cannot be abandoned (although men need not attain it and may be entirely mistaken in their attempts).<sup>284</sup> The will to happiness is a will, but one we did not choose and cannot control.

This will not chosen by man is mirrored negatively and unpropitiously, as it were, in Augustine's notion of sin, which dwells in man and works against his will. The sin that dwells in us (Rom. 7:17,20) arouses "unlawful desires" (*illicita desideria*), to which the will may not give its consent at first, but which it often yields to. Only after the consent is the original desire transformed into an act: *affectus* becomes *effectus*.<sup>285</sup> The presence of two wills not chosen by man, or propensities (the will to happiness and the sin inspiring illicit desires), might seem suspiciously close to the Manichaean anthropological dualism, and Augustine quickly goes on to add that the sin dwelling in man is not some invasion by a nature not our own (*naturae vigor alienae*), but a symptom of our own sickness (*languor nostrae*). The situation of the split is inherent in men, and they cannot be completely set free from it in this life.<sup>286</sup>

<sup>284</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(1),1: CCL 40, 1666.

<sup>285</sup> *Quid enim operatur peccatum nolentibus nobis, nisi sola illicita desideria? Quibus si voluntatis non adhibeatur assensus; movetur quidem nonnullus affectus, sed nullus ei relaxatur effectus. ... Operantur ergo peccatum haec desideria; quibus si oboedimus, et nos operamur ...* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 118(3),1: CCL 40, 1671).

<sup>286</sup> *Motum porro illiciti desiderii, cui non oboediendo non eum nos operamur, ideo et nos agere dicimur, quoniam non est naturae vigor alienae, sed languor est nostrae; a quo languore*

Augustine traces the genealogy of this situation back to the transgression of the first man, who did not want to submit to the truth and succumbed to futility, and so the whole of human nature “was corrupted at its root” (*tamquam in radice vitiata*).<sup>287</sup> The misery of mortal existence is in a certain sense “hereditary” henceforth (*quodam modo hereditaria*);<sup>288</sup> from their very birth, men are tied by the “bonds of original sin” (*originalis vincula peccati*).<sup>289</sup> This unhappy predicament is manifested in the split of man through concupiscence as a desire related to the flesh which conflicts with the spirit.<sup>290</sup>

Man is saved from his deadly plight by the Son of God, who voluntarily participated in human mortality in order that the whole human race might participate in divinity.<sup>291</sup> The allotted portion of divinity<sup>292</sup> is conditioned by the human will, namely faith and the acts of love; and yet, this will is prepared and supported by God’s grace.<sup>293</sup> “The bending of the heart” as the starting point of action is hidden; it is not only the work of man, but also of God who works in men in his inscrutable ways.<sup>294</sup> This good longing, which competes with the evil concupiscence dwelling in man, is also here called “good” or “praiseworthy” concupiscence (*bona, laudabilis concupiscentia*) or love of that love (*dilectionis dilectio*).<sup>295</sup> It makes us “find delight in goodness”;

---

*omnimodo salvi erimus, cum et animo et corpore immortales facti fuerimus* (Enarr. Psalm. 118(3),1: CCL 40, 1671f.).

<sup>287</sup> ... *illam humiliationem ... , quae facta est in Adam, in quo omnis creatura humana tamquam in radice vitiata, quoniam veritati subiecta esse non voluit, subiecta est vanitati* (cf. Rom. 8:20) (Enarr. Psalm. 118(17),5: CCL 40, 1721).

<sup>288</sup> *Et ecce tota ista dura et infelix aerumna mortalium, quodam modo hereditaria est incrementum superborum* (Enarr. Psalm. 118(9),1: CCL 40, 1689).

<sup>289</sup> *Iamvero si in omnibus peccatoribus terrae non incongrue deputantur et parvuli, propter originalis vincula peccati, etiam ipsi in similitudine praevaricationis Adae* (cf. Rom. 5:14), *ad illam praevaricationem pertinere monstrantur, quae, data lege in paradiso, prima commissae est; ac per hoc recte, nullo prorsus excepto, praevaricatores aestimantur omnes peccatores terrae* (Enarr. Psalm. 118(25),5: CCL 40, 1750).

<sup>290</sup> ... *considerans huius mortalitatis miseriam, in qua iugum grave super filios Adam, a die exitus de ventre matris eorum, sic in omnibus pertenditur usque in diem sepulturae in matrem omnium* (cf. Ecclus. 40:1), *ut propter carnem concupiscentem adversus spiritum* (cf. Gal. 5:17), *etiam regenerati genere sub eius gravitate cogantur* (Enarr. Psalm. 118(19),3: CCL 40, 1727).

<sup>291</sup> See Enarr. Psalm. 118(19),6: CCL 40, 1728; similarly also Enarr. Psalm. 118(16),6: CCL 40, 1718.

<sup>292</sup> See Enarr. Psalm. 118(16),1: CCL 40, 1716.

<sup>293</sup> See Enarr. Psalm. 118(11),6: CCL 40, 1698; Enarr. Psalm. 118(25),6: CCL 40, 1751.

<sup>294</sup> See Enarr. Psalm. 118(23),8: CCL 40, 1744.

<sup>295</sup> *Concupivit anima mea desiderare iustificationes tuas in omni tempore* (Ps. 118[119]:20). *Laudabilis est ista concupiscentia, non damnabilis. Non de hac dictum est: Non concupisces*

it is a “sweetness” (*suavitas, dulcedo*) of the good<sup>296</sup> (according to Augustine, the attraction of the good is rendered by the Greek expression χρηστότης, which he translates both as *suavitas* and *bonitas*<sup>297</sup>). One cannot learn this sweetness; it can only be experienced as a freely given gift. Only then is it joined by *disciplina* (the ability to endure hardship, reject other kinds of sweetness etc.) and knowledge (*scientia*), which shows the truth. Nevertheless, it is the sweetness that is given which makes it possible to know, but also to act.<sup>298</sup>

Only grace, as the gift of inner sweetness, or love, thus enables one to fulfil the commands of the law which cannot be fulfilled otherwise. One may wonder here why it is that Augustine regards the fulfilment of the commandments of the law as a priori unattainable and “the whole world” therefore as inevitably “guilty”.<sup>299</sup> This reasoning (in which Augustine refers to the apostle Paul<sup>300</sup>) is based on Augustine’s idea that the law can only be fulfilled by love, not by a slavish fear attempting to obey the commandments and thus avoid a punishment.<sup>301</sup> In his opinion, the donated “sweetness” of love, which man cannot give to himself, is the only legitimate motivation of one’s acts. Those who are led by any other motivation get entangled in the “law of works” and want to attain righteousness on their own and refuse the

---

(Exod. 20:17; Deut. 5:21), *sed de illa qua caro concupiscit adversus spiritum* (Gal. 5:17). ... *hac autem bona concupiscentia ... concupiscit spiritus adversus carnem* (Gal. 5:17) (*Enarr. Psalm.* 118(8),3: CCL 40, 1687). On concupiscence in the positive sense, see also *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(7),3: CCL 40, 1683; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(8),4: CCL 40, 1687 f.

<sup>296</sup> *Nihil hic ergo aliud dictum existimo: Suavitatem fecisti cum servo tuo* (Ps. 118[119]:65), *nisi, fecisti ut me delectaret bonum. Quando enim delectat bonum, magnum est Dei donum. ... quomodo dicit: Suavitatem doce me* (Ps. 118[119]:66), *nisi ut ei gratia Dei magis magisque innotescat dulcedine bonitatis?* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 118(17),1–2: CCL 40, 1718 f.).

<sup>297</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(17),1: CCL 40, 1718. Augustine says in a number of passages of his exposition that he also takes the Greek codices into consideration; see e.g. *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(14),2: CCL 40, 1709; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(15),2: CCL 40, 1712; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(32),7: CCL 40, 1775.

<sup>298</sup> ... *quomodo suavitas docetur, si non detur? ... Suavitas enim disci non potest, nisi delectet. Item disciplina, quae significat emendatoriam tribulationem, accipiendo discitur; id est, non audiendo vel legendo, vel cogitando, sed experiendo. ... Docet ergo Deus suavitatem inspirando delectationem, docet disciplinam temperando tribulationem, docet scientiam insinuando cognitionem. ... sic docet ut scienda sciamus, aperiendo veritatem, sic docet ut facienda faciamus, inspirando suavitatem. Neque enim frustra ei dicitur: Doce me ut faciam voluntatem tuam* (Ps. 142[143]:10). *Sic, inquit, doce ut faciam, non tantummodo tu sciam* (*Enarr. Psalm.* 118(17),3: CCL 40, 1720).

<sup>299</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(27),3: CCL 40, 1758.

<sup>300</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(27),3: CCL 40, 1758.

<sup>301</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(11),1: CCL 40, 1696.

freely given grace, the only thing that can justify them.<sup>302</sup> The “meditation on the law” which the psalm exhorts<sup>303</sup> thus becomes, in Augustine’s interpretation, the knowledge that the law (either the commandment given to the first men in paradise, or the law written in human nature, or the written law) mainly convicts man of what he cannot do, thus inviting him to grace:<sup>304</sup> it makes him ask for what is commanded and what he cannot fulfil on his own.<sup>305</sup>

Augustine’s exposition of Psalm 118 (119) clearly shows the role of the affective influence of grace on the human will. In order to be able to compete with the unpropitious inherited concupiscence, i.e., the sin dwelling in men and arousing illicit desires in them, grace primarily adopts the form of a “sweetness” that inspires men to action, and only then the form of discipline and knowledge as well. This “sweetness” is delight in the love which the Holy Spirit pours out into the hearts of men and which, in Augustine’s opinion, is the only thing which can fulfil the law, the aim of which is love.<sup>306</sup>

### 2.8. *The Dialectic of Will and Grace*

(De bono viduitatis, Ep. 157, De patientia,  
Enchiridion ad Laurentium, Retractationes)

Augustine’s notion of faith as a voluntary decision of the will, which is simultaneously given by grace, and the subsequent acts of love based on the influence of the Holy Spirit, who “pours out” love into the hearts of men, is manifested in several works concerned with Christian spirituality. The core of his doctrine on the relationship between the will and grace is expressed in Augustine’s famous statement “Grant what you command, and command what you will”, which returns in many modifications in these works.

In his treatise on widowhood for Juliana (*De bono viduitatis* from 414), addressed to the mother of the Christian virgin Demetrias, for whom the principles of an ascetic life were summarised by Pelagius years previously,<sup>307</sup>

<sup>302</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(10),5: CCL 40, 1694; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(22),2: CCL 40, 1737; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(26),1: CCL 40, 1753.

<sup>303</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(17),8: CCL 40, 1722.

<sup>304</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(25),5: CCL 40, 1750.

<sup>305</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(4),2: CCL 40, 1674; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(11),4–5: CCL 40, 1698; *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(27),6: CCL 40, 1759.

<sup>306</sup> See *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(14),4: CCL 40, 1710; similarly also *Enarr. Psalm.* 118(27),6: CCL 40, 1759.

<sup>307</sup> See above, p. 170, n. 18. On the anti-Pelagian purport of Augustine’s letter to Juliana, see Y.-M. Duval, “Pélage en son temps”, 99 n. 16.



Augustine says that opting for a life of continence (in this case giving up a second marriage) is a gift of God (*beneficium*): “we are able to do this with the help of him from whose command this exhortation comes” (*ipso adiuvante id valemus, quo iubente admonemur*).<sup>308</sup> Whatever we achieve must not be attributed to ourselves, but to God; and yet, “to receive and to hold” that gift is a matter of our will (*accipere et habere tuum sit*).<sup>309</sup> Not even God’s commandments (which do not include continence) can be fulfilled without the assistance of grace; this is why men pray for God’s help: “Let us ask him to give us what he commands us to have.”<sup>310</sup> According to Augustine, this formulation expresses the whole dialectic of the human will and God’s grace: God commands men and provides them with freedom of choice. In the present situation, men are not able to fulfil the commandments through the free choice of their will, but they may pray for its fulfilment and thank for it. “The willing is ours” (*nostrum est velle*) thus means mainly that with their choice of the will, men are to ask for God’s aid and accept it.<sup>311</sup> It is therefore useful to encourage men to do even what they cannot achieve on their own.<sup>312</sup> For the same reason, Augustine says in another passage that we have the free choice of the will in order that we may ask for God’s help<sup>313</sup> or honour his grace.<sup>314</sup>

In Augustine’s opinion, the correlation between the free choice of the will and God’s grace is not limited to freely calling upon grace or its acceptance. The will is to be transformed by grace because after all, it is the will which fulfils God’s commandments. The will may be more free to the extent that it is “more healthy” (*sanior*); in other words, when it is “more subject” to divine grace and mercy, says Augustine in his letter to Hilary of Syracuse (from 414).<sup>315</sup> Grace thus does not cancel freedom of choice, but strengthens

<sup>308</sup> *De bono vid.* 16,20: CSEL 41, 328. English translation by R. Kearney, 126.

<sup>309</sup> *De bono vid.* 16,20: CSEL 41, 328.

<sup>310</sup> *Proinde petamus, ut det, quod ut habeamus iubet* (*De bono vid.* 17,21: CSEL 41, 329). English translation by R. Kearney, 127.

<sup>311</sup> *Nostrum est enim velle; sed voluntas ipsa et admonetur, ut surgat, et sanatur, ut valeat, et dilatatur, ut capiat, et inpletur, ut habeat* (*De bono vid.* 17,21: CSEL 41, 329 f.).

<sup>312</sup> *Sed oremus, ut det quod iubet adiuvando et inspirando, qui commonuit quae velle debeamus praecipiendo et vocando* (*De bono vid.* 17,21: CSEL 41, 330).

<sup>313</sup> ... *et ad hoc se intellegant habere ... liberum arbitrium, non ut superba voluntate respuant adiutorium, sed ut pia voluntate invocent dominum* (*Ep.* 157,2,7: CSEL 44, 453 f.).

<sup>314</sup> *Magna est ergo utilitas praeceptorum, si libero arbitrio tantum detur, ut gratia Dei amplius honoretur* (*Ep.* 167,4,15: CSEL 44, 603).

<sup>315</sup> *Haec enim voluntas libera tanto erit liberior quanto sanior, tanto autem sanior quanto divinae misericordiae gratiaeque subiectior* (*Ep.* 157,2,8: CSEL 44, 454).

it: God helps willing men carry out what they ask of him.<sup>316</sup> As the free choice of the will of man is restricted by the “law in his members” and a “bad habit”,<sup>317</sup> by itself it is not capable of the love which will fulfil the divine law. This may only be bestowed on man in order that he may find efficacious “delight” (*condelectari legi Dei*, cf. Rom. 7:22) in the law of God. Without the grace of God, therefore, the freedom of the will is not freedom, but proud rebelliousness (*libertas sine Dei gratia non est libertas sed contumacia*).<sup>318</sup>

In his treatise on patience (*De patientia* from 417), Augustine does not speak of mere healing or strengthening of the will through grace, but (referring to Phil. 2:13) he explicitly mentions the gift of the will. It is God who “works” in men the good will that loves him;<sup>319</sup> all virtues (e.g. patience) come from love, and as such are not the result of human efforts, but a gift of God.<sup>320</sup> God first justifies the ungodly without any previous merits and then with his grace assists the just; at the same time, however, grace assists what it has given before,<sup>321</sup> namely righteousness, but not the original efforts of men, as these can only be unrighteous.<sup>322</sup>

While there must be a will in man “to accept what God gives to the one who wills”, as Augustine puts it in another passage, this will is also given to

<sup>316</sup> *Ep.* 157,2,10: CSEL 44, 455 f.

<sup>317</sup> *Ep.* 157,3,15: CSEL 44, 463.

<sup>318</sup> *Ep.* 157,3,16: CSEL 44, 465.

<sup>319</sup> *Nisi ergo amor eius detur inde nobis, non est, unde esse possit in nobis. Ac per hoc voluntas bona, qua diligitur Deus, in homine non potest esse, nisi in quo Deus operatur et velle* (Phil. 2:13). *Haec igitur voluntas bona, id est voluntas Deo fideliter subdita, voluntas sanctitate superni ardoris accensa, voluntas, quae diligit Deum et proximum propter Deum* (*De pat.* 25,22: CSEL 41, 686 f.).

<sup>320</sup> *Caritas autem Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris, non utique ex nobis, sed per spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis* (Rom. 5:5). *Proinde ab illo est patientia iustorum, per quem diffunditur caritas eorum. Quam caritatem laudans atque commendans apostolus inter cetera eius bona dixit eam et cuncta sufferre. Caritas, inquit, magnanima est, et paulo post ait: omnia tolerat* (1 Cor. 13:4,7) (*De pat.* 17,14: CSEL 41, 678). See also *De pat.* 23,20: CSEL 41, 685.

<sup>321</sup> ... *haec est, inquam, electio gratiae, qua omnia bona merita praeveniuntur humana. Si enim ullis bonis meritis datur, iam non gratis donatur, sed debita redditur, ac per hoc non vero nomine gratia nuncupatur ... Si autem, ut vera sit gratia, id est gratuita, nihil invenit in homine, cui merito debeatur ... profecto ipsa dat merita, non meritis datur. Praevenit ergo etiam fidem, ex qua omnia bona opera incipiunt. ... Porro autem gratia non solum adiuvat iustum, verum etiam iustificat impium. Et ideo etiam cum adiuvat iustum, et videtur eius meritis reddi, nec sic desinit esse gratia, quoniam id adiuvat, quod est ipsa largita* (*De pat.* 20,17: CSEL 41, 682).

<sup>322</sup> *Quod cum ita sit, quid est homo utens in hac vita propria voluntate, antequam eligat et diligat Deum, nisi iniustus et impius? ... Quia ipse non potest eligere vel diligere, nisi prius electus dilectusque curetur, qui caecitate eligenda non cernit et languore diligenda fastidit* (*De pat.* 22,19: CSEL 41, 684).

him by God.<sup>323</sup> It is not in the power of man to manage the causes which turn his heart in one direction or another; even the evil caused by the will runs beyond its control and enslaves it. This is rendered by the biblical expression “hardening of the heart” (Exod. 7:3).<sup>324</sup> Only God himself can overcome this hardening of the heart, provided that he wants to: he can “enlarge” (*dilatatio*) the hearts of men with his grace, i.e., love poured into them.<sup>325</sup> In this respect, the hearts of men are not in their own hands, but their wills are controlled by God.

Probably the most sceptical account of the free choice of the will appears in Augustine’s work on faith, hope and love, addressed to his correspondent Laurentius (*Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate* from between 421 and 423). The reader even learns that man (Adam) made evil use of the free choice of the will, destroyed himself and lost his freedom of choice as well (*perdidit, amisum est*). From this point on, the “freedom” of man only “loves to sin” (*peccare delectat*). Doing something “freely” (*liberaliter*) means doing it “with delight” (*libenter*), says Augustine; on their own, however, men only find delight in sin:

For it was by the evil use of his free will that man destroyed both himself and his free will (*liberum arbitrium*). When, for instance, a man kills himself, he is of course alive in the act; but once he has killed himself, he no longer lives, nor is he able to restore himself to life. So, too, when by free will sin was committed, sin being the conqueror, free will was lost (*amissum est et liberum arbitrium*); for by whom a man is overcome, to the same also is he bound as slave (2Pet. 2:19). This is certainly the mind of the Apostle Peter. And since this is true, what sort of liberty, I ask you, can the bondsman possess except the delight in sin (*peccare delectat*)? For he serves freely (*liberaliter*) who does with delight (*libenter*) the will of his master. Hence, he who is the servant of sin is free to sin (*ad peccandum liber*).<sup>326</sup>

<sup>323</sup> *Quaest. Hept.* II,9: CCL 33, 72.

<sup>324</sup> *Quaest. Hept.* II,18: CCL 33, 76f.

<sup>325</sup> *Quaest. Hept.* II,107: CCL 33, 122.

<sup>326</sup> *Nam libero arbitrio male utens homo et se perdidit et ipsum. Sicut enim qui se occidit utique vivendo se occidit, sed se occidendo non vivit nec se ipsum poterit resuscitare cum occiderit, ita cum libero peccaretur arbitrio victore peccato amissum est et liberum arbitrium. A quo enim quis devictus est, huic et servus addictus est: Petri certe apostoli est ista sententia. Quae cum vera sit, qualis quaeso potest servi addicti esse libertas nisi quando eum peccare delectat? Liberaliter enim servit qui sui domini voluntatem libenter facit, ac per hoc ad peccandum liber est qui peccati servus est* (*Enchir.* 9,30: CCL 46, 65f.). English translation after L.A. Arand, 37 f. On the “loss” of the free choice of the will as a result of sin (as a lost possibility of choosing good), see M. Huftier, “Libre arbitre”, 189f., n. 4.

“True freedom” (*vera libertas*), i.e., the joy that comes in doing what is right (*laetitia recte facti*), requires God’s grace,<sup>327</sup> which endows men with a love of righteousness (*delectatio iustitiae*) and thus overcomes other, improper delights.<sup>328</sup>

Whether one has faith, hope and love depends on the will, but it is God who works in men to will, not men themselves. It is therefore not the joint working of God’s mercy and the will (in the sense that neither can be missing), but it is the work of God himself, who also endows men with the will (*ut totum detur Deo, qui hominis voluntatem bonam et praeparat adiuvandam et adiuvat praeparatam*). For in the gift of the good will, grace predisposes a man before he wills, to prompt his willing, and following the act of the will, it also endows him with other gifts as well (*nolentem praevenit, ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit*).<sup>329</sup>

This bracketing of the human will is, in Augustine’s opinion, grounded in the transgression of the first man, who had the power either to sin with his will and die, or not to sin and be rewarded with eternal life and the inability to sin (i.e., with constant goodness). As a result of his unfortunate decision, Adam not only threw away the promised reward and was punished with death, but he also lost the power itself. His will and the will of his offspring no longer have the power of not sinning.<sup>330</sup> Augustine’s account of sin which corrupts the human race in its root (*radicaliter*)<sup>331</sup> has already been described before. What is worth mentioning is his remark that the parents do not only burden their children with this transmitted sin, propagated through libidinous procreation (*vitiosa generatio*), but with their own sins as well. Does it mean that sins accumulate over the generations? This is a question which Augustine cannot answer.<sup>332</sup>

Another remarkable thing is Augustine’s reflection on the situation of the first man. It is said that he “could will both good and evil”, but lost this power later as a result of his choice. Even then, however, the free choice of his will could only lead to evil. In order to will the good, he would have needed the assistance of grace from the very beginning:

<sup>327</sup> *Enchir.* 9,30: CCL 46, 66.

<sup>328</sup> *Enchir.* 22,81: CCL 46, 94.

<sup>329</sup> *Enchir.* 9,32: CCL 46, 67.

<sup>330</sup> *Enchir.* 28,105–106: CCL 46, 106 f.

<sup>331</sup> *Enchir.* 14,48: CCL 46, 75.

<sup>332</sup> *Enchir.* 13,46–47: CCL 46, 74 f.

But even then there could have been no merit without grace; because even though sin came about in free will alone, nevertheless free will would not have sufficed to preserve innocence, unless through participation in the immutable Good divine assistance had been offered. ... So, too, in Paradise man was able to destroy himself by forsaking the cause of right through the agency of his will (*per voluntatem*); but if his life of innocence was to be preserved, his mere will (*velle*) to preserve it would have been insufficient, did not God who had made him come to his aid.<sup>333</sup>

Free will is not—we might conclude—condemned to evil as a result of its own choice in the father of the human race, but it was actually created in such a way that it is not capable of anything else. Nevertheless, Augustine does not say this explicitly; perhaps he would even have denied it.<sup>334</sup>

In the situation of the utter helplessness of the will and the corruption of the whole human race, God sent a mediator to men, one the first man would not have needed (although he needed grace as well). The mediator, both man and God, is the only one who can set man free;<sup>335</sup> in Augustine's account he also represents a paradigm of grace as a man: the fact that he was born of the Holy Spirit shows that grace is not preceded by any human merits. It was through the miraculous birth, because of which he avoided the contagion transmitted in the human race, that grace became "natural" (*naturalis*) to this man, and thus he was not capable of committing any sin. This is the realisation of the power "not to be able to sin", which Adam was to gain as a reward for the good choice of his will, although it is an entirely gratuitous realisation.<sup>336</sup> Through this man, as the founder of the new race, grace and justification entered the world, just as through Adam sin and punishment entered it.<sup>337</sup>

<sup>333</sup> *Quamvis sine gratia nec tunc ullum meritum esse potuisset, quia etsi peccatum in solo erat libero arbitrio constitutum, non tamen iustitiae retinendae sufficiebat liberum arbitrium nisi participatione immutabilis boni divinum adiutorium praeberetur. ... sic homo in paradiso ad se occidendum relinquendo iustitiam idoneus erat per voluntatem, ut autem ab eo teneretur vita iustitiae parum erat velle nisi ille qui eum fecerat adiuveret* (*Enchir.* 28,106: CCL 46, 106 f.). English translation after L.A. Arand, 100 f. A. Solignac explains this passage by referring to Augustine's notion of the good, which is not "natural" to men, but it is always God himself, and turning towards him is therefore not in the power of the created being alone; the fall is thus the consequence of "natural deficiency, or determinism" (see A. Solignac, "La condition de l'homme pécheur d'après saint Augustin", in: *NRTh* 78, 1956, 362–366).

<sup>334</sup> C. Harrison (*Rethinking*, 97 f. and 171) is of a different opinion, maintaining that it is exactly what Augustine meant to say, his early works included: according to Harrison, a being created *ex nihilo* cannot actually do otherwise than sin. See also below, chap. III.2.9.

<sup>335</sup> *Enchir.* 28,108: CCL 46, 107.

<sup>336</sup> ... *sic in naturae humanae susceptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia illi homini naturalis quae nullum peccatum posset admittere* (*Enchir.* 12,40: CCL 46, 72).

<sup>337</sup> *Enchir.* 14,50–52: CCL 46, 76.

Through pure grace the man Jesus was received in unity of person with the Son of God; by the same token, all sons of God, adopted by grace, are to be accepted without any previous merits of their own.<sup>338</sup> It is again Jacob from the apostle's exposition in Romans 9 who is an example of this freely given adoption: he was endowed with grace before he could have had any merits of his own and irrespective of them, while his brother, as the "son of wrath", was justly condemned. For reasons which men cannot know, grace distinguishes between those who are saved and those abandoned to damnation so that its greatness could show through the former and the latter as well: the condemned ones are to be a reminder of what the whole human "mass" (*universa conspersio*) would deserve without grace.<sup>339</sup> Some people were thus "justly predestined to punishment" by God (*iuste praedestinavit ad poenam*), while others were mercifully predestined "to grace" (*ad gratiam*).<sup>340</sup>

<sup>338</sup> *Enchir.* 12,40: CCL 46, 72. In his anti-Arian polemic too, Augustine makes it clear that Christ the mediator, the Son of God and, at the same time, the Son of man, has—as the Son of God—the same nature and thus the same will as God the Father. As the Son of man, accepted by grace (*adsumptus gratia*, *Contra ser. Arr.* 7: CSEL 92, 58) to be united in one person with the Son of God, he is by grace exempted from the sin of the human race and endowed with sinlessness, and therefore even with his human will he fulfils not his own will, but the will of God, however much he does so of his own accord. His voluntary fulfilment of the will of God is the opposite of Adam's acts and has the opposite effect as well: while Adam burdened the whole human race with an enslaving punishment through his freely chosen act contradicting the will of God, Christ—also through an act of his will—obeyed the will of God and thus set men free (*Contra ser. Arr.* 7–8: CSEL 92, 56–58). On the incarnation of Christ as the paradigm of grace and the ground of grace bestowed on other men, see B. Studer, *Gratia Christi—Gratia Dei bei Augustinus von Hippo. Christozentrismus oder Theozentrismus?*, Roma 1993, 110–114. This "Christology of grace" (see also above, chap. III.2.2) is regarded by J. McW. Dewart as partially similar to that of Theodore of Mopsuestia (see J. McW. Dewart, "The Christology", 1231–1241).

<sup>339</sup> *Quis enim nisi insipiens Deum iniquum putet, sive iudicium poenale ingerat digno sive misericordiam praestet indigno? ... Miseretur scilicet magna bonitate, obdurat nulla iniquitate, ut nec liberatus de suis meritis gloriatur nec damnatus nisi de suis meritis conqueratur. Sola enim gratia redemptos discernit a perditis, quos in unam perditionis concreverat massam ab origine ducta causa communis. ... Videt enim, si capit, universum genus humanum tam iusto iudicio divino in apostatica radice damnatum ut etiam si nullus inde liberaretur nemo recte posset Dei vituperare iustitiam; et qui liberantur sic oportuisse liberari ut ex pluribus non liberatis, atque in damnationem iustissimam redactis, ostenderetur quid meruisset universa conspersio, et quo etiam istos debitum iudicium Dei duceret nisi eius indebita misericordia subveniret ...* (*Enchir.* 25,98–99: CCL 46, 101–103).

<sup>340</sup> ... bene utens et malis tamquam summe bonus, ad eorum damnationem quos iuste praedestinavit ad poenam, et ad eorum salutem quos benigne praedestinavit ad gratiam (*Enchir.* 26,100: CCL 46, 103).

God could certainly turn the wills of all men to the good if he wanted to, Augustine maintains, because his will is almighty and no created being can hinder his intention. Apparently, he does not want to; he wants to save only some and demonstrate a just punishment by means of others. In any case, his will is invincible and is ever undefeated (*invicta*). For this, Augustine is willing to sacrifice the New Testament idea of a God who wills “that all men should be saved” (1 Tim. 2:4).<sup>341</sup>

In the light of our subject matter, it is also worth mentioning Augustine’s *Retractationes*, i.e., critical notes from the period 426–427 commenting on all his previous works. To his early anti-Manichaean emphasis on the volitional character of evil, i.e., sin, Augustine hastens to add that apart from freely chosen sin, there is also a “punishment for sin”, which is sin as well although it does not come out of the individual will.<sup>342</sup> In the first man, “human nature” itself committed sin,<sup>343</sup> and from that time on it has not remained in its original state, but a corrupted one. Moreover, in the first man all men committed sin as they were “implicated” in him and therefore bear not only the consequences of the guilt, but the guilt itself as well.<sup>344</sup> Sin has become, “in a certain sense, hereditary” (*quodammodo haereditarium*), and baptism not only removes the guilt for the sin (*reatus*) from man, but also helps the “healing of the will” (*voluntas ipsa sanatur*).<sup>345</sup>

---

<sup>341</sup> *Enchir.* 24,96–25,98; *CCL* 46, 100 f.; *Enchir.* 26,102; *CCL* 46, 104. On Augustine’s exposition of the line in 1 Tim. 2:4, see below, chap. III.2.10a incl. n. 459. Under the influence of his doctrine of grace, Augustine’s notion of the New Testament God has gained a peculiar character. In his polemic (from between 420 and 421) against a Gnostic treatise of uncertain origin (see *Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,1,1: *CCL* 49, 35; *Contra advers. leg. proph.* II,12,40: *CCL* 49, 129 f.), in which the Old Testament and its cruel God are rejected (*Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,16,30: *CCL* 49, 57 f.), Augustine makes it clear that although the New Testament is a message of love fulfilling the law, and in this sense it overcomes fear, both Testaments give testimony about the same God in his kindness and sternness (*Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,16,34–17,35: *CCL* 49, 62–64). However, the Old Testament was concerned with temporal rewards and punishments, which men deserved by their acts, while in the Gospel the same God predetermined men regardless of their merits (*Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,24,51: *CCL* 49, 84; *Contra advers. leg. proph.* II,11,37: *CCL* 49, 123) to eternal rewards and punishments, and is in fact even stricter (*Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,16,29: *CCL* 49, 56 f.; *Contra advers. leg. proph.* I,16,32: *CCL* 49, 60).

<sup>342</sup> *Retract.* I,16,2: *CCL* 57, 52; *Retract.* I,13,5: *CCL* 57, 38.

<sup>343</sup> ... in primis hominibus natura humana peccavit (*Retract.* I,10,3: *CCL* 57, 32).

<sup>344</sup> ... peccatum, quod eos [parvulos] ex Adam dicimus originaliter trahere, id est reatu eius implicatos, et ob hoc poenae obnoxios detineri ... (*Retract.* I,15,2: *CCL* 57, 45 f.).

<sup>345</sup> Et illud quod in parvulis dicitur originale peccatum, cum adhuc non utantur arbitrio vo-

The motif of grace which prepares, sets free and heals the will is another amendment that Augustine adds to his older works. It is true that through the will we participate in faith and good deeds, as he said before, but even this will is given by God.<sup>346</sup>

Augustine adds the largest number of self-critical amendments to his expositions of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Faced with the Pelagian interpretation of Romans 7 as a situation of a man "under the law",<sup>347</sup> he has to retract his older interpretation and makes it clear that the apostle is describing a conflict of the will which affects even a man endowed with the grace of the Gospel. Even in such a man concupiscence remains, preventing him from the good works which he has resolved to do. Although concupiscence is overcome by love poured out into the hearts of men through the Holy Spirit, it still remains in the mortal body and cannot be eradicated completely in this life.<sup>348</sup>

---

*luntatis, non absurde vocatur etiam voluntarium, quia ex prima hominis mala voluntate contractum factum est quodammodo hereditarium. ... Ideo gratia Dei non solum reatus omnium praeteritorum solvitur in omnibus qui baptizantur in Christo, quod fit spiritu regenerationis, verum etiam in grandibus voluntas ipsa sanatur et praeparatur a domino, quod fit spiritu fidei et caritatis* (Retract. I,13,5; CCL 57, 38).

<sup>346</sup> Retract. I,9,2: CCL 57, 23 f.; Retract. I,15,4: CCL 57, 47 f.; Retract. I,22,4: CCL 57, 66; Retract. I,23,3: CCL 57, 69 f.; Retract. I,26: CCL 57, 77; Retract. II,8: CCL 57, 97. Augustine bases the notion of the will "prepared by God" on his interpretation of the line in Prov. 8:35 (*praeparatur voluntas a Domino*), which follows the Septuagint (ἐτοιμάζεται θέλησις παρὰ κυρίου; the Vulgate reads *hauriet salutem a Domino*), and to which he often (more than fifty times) refers in his works written from 411 onwards. For more details, see A. Sage, "*Praeparatur voluntas a Domino*", in: REAug 10, 1964, 1–20, esp. the overview of the occurrences, 19 f.

<sup>347</sup> In his exposition of the Pauline letters, Pelagius says that the situation of a "corporeal man", who is "twofold and somehow divided in himself" (*duplex est quodam modo et in semet ipso divisus*), does not involve the apostle himself; the apostle speaks "on behalf of someone else" (*ex alterius persona*), i.e., a man "drunk, as it were, by the habit of sinning" (*quasi inebriatus consuetudine peccatorum*). In such a man, the sin "dwells as a guest and as one in another, not as one with himself, i.e., as something accidental, not natural (*quasi hospes et quasi aliud in alio, non quasi unum, ut accidens scilicet, non naturale*)" (Pelagius, *Expos. Rom.* 7,14–23; Souter 58–60). On Pelagius' interpretation of Rom. 7, which follows that by Origen, see J.P. Burns, "The Interpretation of Romans in the Pelagian Controversy", in: *AugSt* 10, 1979, 43–54. See also above, chap. III.2.4 incl. n. 159.

<sup>348</sup> ... etiam spiritalis hominis iamque sub gratia constituti melius intellegi verba ista monstravimus propter corpus carnis, quod spiritale nondum est, erit autem in resurrectione mortuorum, et propter ipsam carnis concupiscentiam, cum qua ita confligunt sancti non ei consentientes ad malum, ut tamen eius motibus, quibus repugnantibus resistunt, non careant in hac vita (Retract. I,23,1: CCL 57, 68). See also Retract. I,24,2: CCL 57, 72; Retract. I,26: CCL 57, 84; Retract. II,1,1: CCL 57, 89. On the persisting concupiscence, see also Retract. I,15,2: CCL 57, 45 f.;



In the light of hindsight, Augustine accepts that he made a serious mistake in the interpretation of Romans 9, in which he maintained that the predestination of Esau and Jacob is based on the foreknowledge of their future faith. "I had not yet sought diligently enough or discovered up to this time what is the nature of 'the election of grace' (*electio gratiae*)," not preceded by any merits. He would never have said that faith is ours if he had known that faith is also a gift of God. Both faith and our works are undoubtedly acts of the will, says Augustine, but they are gifts as well.<sup>349</sup> It was as late as the answer to Simplicianus (I.2) that "the grace of God conquered": having read Cyprian, Augustine realised that men should "glory in nothing since we have nothing in which to glory" (*in nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil sit*).<sup>350</sup>

### 2.9. *The Epopee of Grace and Condemnation in De civitate Dei*

In the extensive work *De civitate Dei*, written soon after the fall of Rome in 410 as a direct reaction to the historic event<sup>351</sup> (presumably between 413

---

*Retract.* I,19,1: CCL 57, 55 f. On the change in Augustine's interpretation of Romans 7 see above, chap. I.3,3b incl. n. 95; II.1.1; below, chap. III.3.1.

<sup>349</sup> *Nondum diligentius quaesiveram nec adhuc inveneram, qualis sit electio gratiae ... "Quod ergo credimus nostrum est, quod autem bonum operamur illius est qui credentibus dat spiritum sanctum" (Prop. Rom. 5,2,60, quoted above, I.3,3a, n. 84), profecto non dicerem, si iam scirem etiam ipsam fidem inter Dei munera repperiri, quae dantur in eodem spiritu. Utrumque ergo nostrum est propter arbitrium voluntatis, et utrumque tamen datum est per spiritum fidei et caritatis (Retract. I,23,2: CCL 57, 68 f.).*

<sup>350</sup> *In cuius quaestionis solutione laboratum est quidem pro libero arbitrio voluntatis humanae, sed vicit Dei gratia; nec nisi ad illud potuit perveniri, ut liquidissima veritate dixisse intellegatur apostolus: Quis enim te discernit? Quid autem habes quod non accepisti? Si autem accepisti, quid gloriaris quasi non acceperis? (1 Cor. 4:7) Quod volens etiam martyr Cyprianus ostendere, hoc totum ipso titulo definivit dicens: In nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil est (Retract. II,1,1: CCL 57, 89 f.).* It is a quotation from Cyprian, *Ad Quirinum*, 3,4: CCL 3, 92. On the role of Cyprian in Augustine's doctrine of grace, see above, p. 85.

<sup>351</sup> Augustine himself mentions the connection of this work with the fall of Rome and the accusation of the Christians as the cause of the wrath of God; see *Retract.* II,43,1: CCL 57, 124 f. Augustine's sermons from between 410 and 412, concerned with this theme, show that the fall of Rome was, first, a calamitous event in the history of the city, but then went on to become a crucial blow not only materially, but also in the psychological and religious sense (for more details, see J.-C. Fredouille, "Les sermons d'Augustin sur la chute de Rome", in: G. Madec, ed., *Augustin prédicateur*, 439–448). On Augustine's "rhetorical" reaction (in his sermons and in *De civ. Dei* I) and his "ideologised" narration of the history of Rome in *De civ.*

and 427<sup>352</sup>), Augustine's primary concern is not with grace or the polemic against the Pelagians, but with the Christian confrontation with the collapsing pagan world and its religion.<sup>353</sup> Nevertheless, it is a treatise in which Augustine presented a substantial part of his theology and in which he addressed the issue of grace to a large extent as well.

As we know from Augustine's own account, the twenty-two books of *De civitate Dei* make up two main parts: polemical (books I–X) and expository (books XI–XXII). His polemic in the first part of the treatise is aimed at the reprimand that it was Christian disrespect for the traditional gods that brought about the fall of Rome; Augustine uses the opportunity for a critical analysis of the ambition of Roman religion and Roman philosophy to lead both individual men and the city of men to happiness, either in this life (books I–V), or in the eternal one (books VI–X).<sup>354</sup> The point of departure for the second theme is Varro's classification of theology into fabulous (narratives of gods as presented by poets), natural (the teachings of philosophers) and civil theology (public cults which bring the community together): *theologia fabulosa, naturalis, civilis*. The aspiration of fabulous and civil theology, which rather focus on earthly happiness and the actual efficiency of which is regarded with reservations even by the best Roman thinkers (e.g. Varro and Seneca), is the first theme of the polemic (books VI–VII). In the next one Augustine deals with the kind of “natural theology” which he regards as probably the most successful pagan attempt at bringing man to happiness beyond the earthly life, namely Platonism, represented here by Apuleius of Madaura<sup>355</sup> and Porphyry, “the most learned

---

*Dei* II–V and XVIII, see H. Inglebert, *Les romains chrétiens face à l'histoire de Rome. Histoire, christianisme et romanité en Occident dans l'Antiquité tardive (III<sup>e</sup>–V<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Paris 1996, 421–500.

<sup>352</sup> P. Brown dates books I–III to 413, books IV–V to 413–415, books VI–X to 415–417, books XI–XIII to 417–418, books XIV–XVI to 418–420, book XVII to 420–425, book XVIII to 425, and books XIX–XXII to 425–427 (see P. Brown, *Augustine*, 280 ff., 380).

<sup>353</sup> As G. Madec points out, *De civitate Dei* is an extensive elaboration on the purport of Augustine's early work *De vera religione* (see G. Madec, “Le *De civitate Dei* comme *De vera religione*”, in: idem, *Petites études augustinienes*, Paris 1994, 189–213).

<sup>354</sup> See *Retract.* II,43,1: CCL 57, 124 f.; *Ep.* 1A\* *ad Firmum* 1: BA 46B, 56; *De civ. Dei* X,32: CCL 48, 313 f.; *De civ. Dei* XVIII,1: CCL 48, 592.

<sup>355</sup> On Augustine's polemic against Apuleius, see L. Karfíková, “Augustins Polemik gegen Apuleius”, in: *Apuleius, De deo Socratis—Über den Gott des Sokrates*, eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen von M. Baltes et al., Darmstadt 2004, 162–189.

of the philosophers",<sup>356</sup> who, unfortunately, was hostile to Christianity (books VIII–X).<sup>357</sup>

The expository part builds on the notion of a double *civitas*, the city of God and the earthly city or the city of the devil.<sup>358</sup> These, however, are not historical, but eschatological communities<sup>359</sup>—entangled together in this world—in which human (and angelic) beings participate solely through their voluntary orientation or their "love": love of God or love of self. According to Augustine himself, in the expository part of his work he describes the origin (books XI–XV), history (books XVI–XVIII) and eschatological fulfilment (books XIX–XXII) of the two cities.<sup>360</sup> As for the purport of this work as a whole, in my opinion, it aims to show an entirely different relationship between religion and earthly history than the one Roman culture relied on, and thus establish firm grounds for the self-understanding of Christianity as

---

<sup>356</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIX,22: CCL 48, 690 (*doctissimus philosophorum*); similarly also *De civ. Dei* XXII,3: CCL 48, 809 (*nobilissimus philosophus paganorum*). As we know from Augustine's account, Porphyry won him over by rejecting Plato's doctrine on the reincarnation of souls (*De civ. Dei* X,30: CCL 47, 307f.; *De civ. Dei* XII,21: CCL 48, 378; *De civ. Dei* XIII,19: CCL 48, 402; *De civ. Dei* XXII,12: CCL 48, 833; *De civ. Dei* XXII,27: CCL 48, 854f.), and also as a result of his notion of the first "principles", similar to the Christian Trinity (God the Father, the intellect of the Father and what holds the middle place between the two; see *De civ. Dei* X,23: CCL 47, 296). Porphyry's doctrine on demons is, according to Augustine, contradictory: apart from the reasonable thoughts rejecting this weak spot of most Platonists, one can also find there extremely superstitious ideas on that matter (*De civ. Dei* X,9–11: CCL 47, 281–286). On Augustine's relationship with Porphyry, see G. Madec, "Augustin et Porphyre. Ébauche d'un bilan des recherches et des conjectures", in: M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Sofias maiétores. Chercheurs de sagesse (Hommage à J. Pépin)*, Paris 1992, 367–382; I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 443–465 (more literature).

<sup>357</sup> On the structure of the work, see R.J. Deferrari—M.J. Keeler, "St. Augustine's 'City of God': Its Plan and Development", in: *American Journal of Philosophy*, 50, 1929, 109–137; J.-C. Guy, *Unité et structure logique de la « Cité de Dieu » de saint Augustin*, Paris 1961; J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 74–77 (on the number of 22 books, presumably inspired not by the Manichaean *Living Gospel* consisting of the same number of books, but rather by the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, which also corresponds to the number of works in the traditional Old Testament canon and to the number of parts in Ps. 119 [118], see *ibid.*, 77–86).

<sup>358</sup> On this dualistic conception and its sources (partially perhaps also Manichaean), see J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*; K. Rudolph, "Augustinus Manichaicus—Das Problem von Konstanz und Wandel", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 1–15.

<sup>359</sup> *De civ. Dei* I,35: CCL 47, 34; *De civ. Dei* X,32: CCL 47, 314.

<sup>360</sup> See *Retract.* II,43,2: CCL 57, 125; *Ep.* 1A\* *ad Firmum* 1: BA 46B, 56. According to I. Bochet, books XI–XXII focus on the way Christianity brings pagan philosophy in its three traditional parts to perfection (see *De civ. Dei* VIII,4: CCL 47, 220): natural (*naturalis*) in books XI–XIV, rational (*rationalis*) in books XV–XVIII and moral (*moralis*) in books XIX–XXII (see I. Bochet, *Le firmament*, 430–443).

an eschatological religion in the full meaning of the word, i.e., as a religion in which the crucial choices take place in human history, but its fulfilment exceeds it.<sup>361</sup>

What must be remembered here is the fact that the dividing line between both cities, which is invisible in human history,<sup>362</sup> is drawn by the free wills of rational beings (men and angels) turning either towards God or themselves: “Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self.”<sup>363</sup> The love of self (*amor sui*) means, in Augustine’s opinion, finding delight in oneself and longing to be the only principle of oneself, i.e., preferring one’s own self-sufficiency to dependence on God, putting oneself in the place of God, and wanting to be “like God” (Gen. 3:5).<sup>364</sup> On the contrary, love of God means that the created beings turn to the creator and give their consent to their own dependence on him.

According to Augustine’s exposition of Gen. 1:3–4, the division based on the two kinds of “love” or will<sup>365</sup> originated among the angels, as some of them turned to God as their creator or principle, while some—because of the love of self—fell away from him.<sup>366</sup> Nevertheless, even fallen angels have a good nature, says Augustine, and their “wickedness” thus consists only in their evil wills.<sup>367</sup> The evil will (*mala voluntas*), which prefers itself to God, is also called “pride” (*superbia*) here,<sup>368</sup> and is considered to be the cause

<sup>361</sup> On Augustine’s “secularisation” of the state (even the Christian one) into a neutral instrument without legitimate religious ambitions, on his “eschatologisation” of the church and on his conception of *saeculum* as a space where the city of God and the earthly city are still mingled indistinguishably and do not correspond to any earthly institution, see R.A. Markus, *Saeculum*. On the presumed influence of the Donatist dissident Tyconius on this notion, see *ibid.*, 116 incl. n. 4.

<sup>362</sup> See, e.g., *De civ. Dei* I,35: CCL 47, 34; *De civ. Dei* XI,1: CCL 48, 321 f.

<sup>363</sup> *Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui* (*De civ. Dei* XIV,28: CCL 48, 451). English translation by M. Dods, 282 f.

<sup>364</sup> See *De civ. Dei* XIV,13: CCL 48, 434 f.

<sup>365</sup> *Recta itaque voluntas est bonus amor et voluntas perversa malus amor* (*De civ. Dei* XIV,7: CCL 48, 422).

<sup>366</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, the creation of light on the first day (Gen. 1:3–4) refers to angels, and its division from the darkness suggests the separation of angels into two cities (see *De civ. Dei* XI,9–21: CCL 48, 328–340; *De civ. Dei* XI,33: CCL 48, 352 f.).

<sup>367</sup> *De civ. Dei* XI,17: CCL 48, 336 f.; *De civ. Dei* XIX,13: CCL 48, 679 f.

<sup>368</sup> *Cum vero causa miseriae malorum angelorum quaeritur, ea merito occurrit, quod ab illo, qui summe est, aversi ad se ipsos conversi sunt, qui non summe sunt; et hoc vitium quid aliud quam superbia nuncupetur?* (*De civ. Dei* XII,6: CCL 48, 359).

of misery as the opposite of blessedness. Because an intellectual being may attain real happiness only by adherence to God (*adhaerere Deo*),<sup>369</sup> created spirits, who were to attain happiness through their wills (a voluntary turning to God as their principle), are inflicted with its opposite by their very wills. Therefore, if it had not been for the erring wills, evil would not exist. The only cause of evil is the evil will itself, which has no cause: there is no “efficient cause” (*causa efficiens*) of the evil will; on the contrary, it becomes the “deficient” cause (*deficiens*), the cause of the defection of good being,<sup>370</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, God is “the supreme being” (*summa essentia* or *οὐσία*, *summe est*; cf. Exod. 3:14), endowing some beings created from nothing with a more ample, and others with a more limited being or goodness.<sup>371</sup> Therefore, everything which is is good by nature.<sup>372</sup>

The unfortunate capacity of the will to turn towards itself instead to God, i.e., to abandon that which has supreme being for that which has less, is caused by the fact that the will is made out of nothing. Having been created out of nothing, it may take an unpropitious turn—that is why Augustine says that nothing (*nihil*) is the cause of the evil will.<sup>373</sup> This does not mean, however, that nothing is an ontological entity competing with being (in the way the darkness struggles with the light in Manichaeism); it rather renders the aspect of contingency, inherent in the created being and bringing about its instability and fragility.<sup>374</sup>

<sup>369</sup> *De civ. Dei* XII,1: CCL 48, 355.

<sup>370</sup> *Huius porro malae voluntatis causa efficiens si quaeratur, nihil invenitur. Quid est enim quod facit voluntatem malam, cum ipsa faciat opus malum? Ac per hoc mala voluntas efficiens est operis mali, malae autem voluntatis efficiens nihil est. ... in mala natura voluntas mala esse non poterat, sed in bona, mutabili tamen, cui vitium hoc posset nocere. ... Cum enim se voluntas relicto superiore ad inferiora convertit, efficitur mala, non quia malum est, quo se convertit, sed quia perversa est ipsa conversio. ... Nemo igitur quaerat efficientem causam malae voluntatis; non enim est efficiens, sed deficiens, quia nec illa effectio sed defectio. Deficere namque ab eo, quod summe est, ad id, quod minus est, hoc est incipere habere voluntatem malam* (*De civ. Dei* XII,6–7: CCL 48, 360–362).

<sup>371</sup> See *De civ. Dei* XII,2: CCL 48, 357. On Augustine’s ontology, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L’ordre*, 35–47.

<sup>372</sup> See *De civ. Dei* XII,5: CCL 48, 359.

<sup>373</sup> This notion is criticised by Julian of Eclanum as a Manichaean one; see below, chap. III.3.4 incl. n. 143.

<sup>374</sup> *Hoc scio, naturam Dei numquam, nusquam, nulla ex parte posse deficere, et ea posse deficere, quae ex nihilo facta sunt. Quae tamen quanto magis sunt et bona faciunt (tunc enim aliquid faciunt), causas habent efficientes; in quantum autem deficiunt et ex hoc mala faciunt (quid enim tunc faciunt nisi vana?), causas habent deficientes* (*De civ. Dei* XII,8: CCL 48, 362).

Like angels, men were created with free will, through which they were to turn towards God.<sup>375</sup> And, like the renegade angels, men in their pride preferred themselves to God and thus came closer to nothing, out of which they were made, instead of to God as the supreme being.<sup>376</sup> The Platonists are wrong, says Augustine, when they maintain that the misery of the soul is brought about by the flesh, which weighs down the soul. It is the will which causes both corruption and misery.<sup>377</sup> The flesh has a different role in Augustine's account: unlike angels, whose fall was unique, definite and irredeemable, men are punished by the loss of power over themselves in this life;<sup>378</sup> as a consequence, "we cannot do the things we would" because "the flesh lusts against the spirit" (Rom. 7:16; Gal. 5:17).<sup>379</sup> At the same time, men are also inflicted with a "second death" (Rev. 2:11; 20:6; 21:8), i.e., not only a physical death as the end of their earthly life, but eternal misery, prolonging their miserable split existence away from God for ever.<sup>380</sup>

For Augustine, the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) mainly causes the affliction which brings misery, both temporal and eternal, to men. In fact, however, this is only true of the first man, who alone was able to make a real choice. Adam's race is then inflicted with the inherited punishment<sup>381</sup> of restricted self-control, which will only be carried out with great difficulty. And yet, says Augustine, even the fallen men have

<sup>375</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXII,1: CCL 48, 806 f. To be more precise, man was created with a "good will", which was corrupted as a result of his own vice (see *De civ. Dei* XIV,11: CCL 48, 431 f.).

<sup>376</sup> *Perversa enim est celsitudo deserto eo, cui debet animus inhaerere, principio sibi quodam modo fieri atque esse principium. Hoc fit, cum sibi nimis placet. Sibi vero ita placet, cum ab illo bono immutabili deficit, quod ei magis placere debuit quam ipse sibi. ... Sed vitio depravari nisi ex nihilo facta natura non posset. Ac per hoc ut natura sit, ex eo habet quod a Deo facta est; ut autem ab eo quod est deficiat, ex hoc quod de nihilo facta est. Nec sic defecit homo, ut omnino nihil esset, sed ut inclinatus ad se ipsum minus esset, quam erat, cum ei qui summe est inhaerebat. Relicto itaque Deo esse in semet ipso, hoc est sibi placere, non iam nihil esse est, sed nihilo propinquare* (*De civ. Dei* XIV,13: CCL 48, 434 f.).

<sup>377</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIV,3: CCL 48, 417 f.; *De civ. Dei* XIV,5–6: CCL 48, 420 f.

<sup>378</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIV,24: CCL 48, 448. On the roles of the flesh and social relations, which differentiate men in their fall from angels, see also J.P. Burns, "Providence as Divine Grace in St. Augustine", in: P.-Y. Fux—J.-M. Roessler—O. Wermelinger (eds.), *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1–7 avril 2007*, Fribourg 2003, I, 211–218.

<sup>379</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXII,23: CCL 48, 845 f.

<sup>380</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIX,28: CCL 48, 698 f.

<sup>381</sup> ... *qua [natura] scilicet propter peccatum vitiata et vinculo mortis obstricta iusteque damnata non alterius condicionis homo ex homine nasceretur. Ac per hoc a liberi arbitrii malo usu series calamitatis huius exorta est, quae humanum genus origine depravata, velut radice corrupta, usque ad secundae mortis exitium, quae non habet finem ... miseriarum conexione perducit* (*De civ. Dei* XIII,14: CCL 48, 395 f.).

the “free choice of the will” in the sense of responsibility for their own actions.<sup>382</sup>

Augustine argues intensely in favour of the voluntary nature of human actions against the determinism of the ancient astrologists, namely against the notion that human fate is determined by the disposition of the stars.<sup>383</sup> He also brings to the fore the difficult issue of whether the human will might, after all, be determined by fate in the sense of the will of the supreme God. This notion, as presented by the Stoics (*Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt*),<sup>384</sup> became the target of criticism in several works by Cicero, who was concerned that the dominion of fate as the pre-established order of causes rules out freedom of choice.<sup>385</sup> Unlike Cicero, however, Augustine does not maintain that God’s foreknowledge of the human will prevents its freedom (*liberum voluntatis arbitrium*).<sup>386</sup> Human deeds come out of the human will, which God foreknows without cancelling its voluntary character:

... [W]e assert both that God knows all things before they come to pass, and that we do by our free will whatsoever we know and feel to be done by us only because we will it. ... But it does not follow that, though there is for God a certain order of all causes, there must therefore be nothing depending on the free exercise of our own wills, for our wills themselves are included in that order of causes which is certain to God, and is embraced by His foreknowledge, for human wills are also causes of human actions; and He who foreknew all the causes of things would certainly among those causes not have been ignorant of our wills.<sup>387</sup>

<sup>382</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIII,21: CCL 48, 404.

<sup>383</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,1–7: CCL 47, 128–135. On this polemic, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L’ordre*, 377–396; on this passage, see also G. Nygren, *Das Prädestinationsproblem*, 198–207; G. Lettieri, *L’altro Agostino*, 381–398. On Augustine’s early interest in astrology and his doctrine on grace, in which human destiny is determined otherwise than by the movement of the stars, which can be represented mathematically, see B. Bruning, “De l’astrologie à la grâce”, in: *Augustiniana*, 41, 1991 (= *Mélanges à T.J. Bavel*, II), 575–643.

<sup>384</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,8: CCL 47, 135f. The quotation of the verses of Cleanthes in Seneca, *Ep.* 107,11: Reynolds 108.

<sup>385</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 136f. See Cicero, *De fato* 10,20: Plasberg-Ax 139; *De fato* 17,40: Plasberg-Ax 148. Cicero also argues against the divine determination of human affairs (and the usefulness of divination based on it) in *De divinatione* II and in *De natura deorum* III (Cotta’s position). On the way Augustine employs these works by Cicero, see M. Testard, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, II, 46–51.

<sup>386</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 136–138.

<sup>387</sup> *Nos ... et Deum dicimus omnia scire antequam fiant, et voluntate nos facere, quidquid a nobis non nisi volentibus fieri sentimus et novimus ... Non est autem consequens, ut, si Deo certus est omnium ordo causarum, ideo nihil sit in nostrae voluntatis arbitrio. Et ipsae quippe voluntates in causarum ordine sunt, qui certus est Deo eiusque praescientia continetur, quoniam*

Following Cicero's idea that nothing happens "without a cause" (which is either nature or the will),<sup>388</sup> Augustine distinguishes four causes: "fatal" (*causa fatalis*), "fortuitous" (*fortuita*), "natural" (*naturalis*) and "voluntary" (*voluntaria*).<sup>389</sup> These he reduces to the voluntary cause, namely God's will, which established the order of nature and the wills of created spirits, human and angelic. God helps (*adiuvat*) their good wills, judges the evil ones and controls all (*ordinat*). He is not the bestower of the will, although he bestows the power which is given to some—but not all—wills. Everything is thus subject to the will of God, to whom the wills of created spirits are subject as well, because their power depends on this single cause.<sup>390</sup> The will of God is thus the efficient cause, one which makes but is never made (*facit nec fit*), while the human will is conditional: it does not only make, but is also made (*facit et fit*).<sup>391</sup> "Wherefore our wills also have just so much power as God willed and foreknew that they should have."<sup>392</sup> And yet, it is not a matter of necessity (*necessitas*), says Augustine, because we would not have our will if we did not want to:

... [W]e do many things which, if we were not willing, we should certainly not do. This is primarily true of the act of willing itself,—for if we will, it is; if we will not, it is not,—for we should not will if we were unwilling.<sup>393</sup>

Therefore, God does not cause the evil will, although he foreknows it.<sup>394</sup> But does the same hold for the good will? According to Augustine, it is "supported" by God. This raises the question of how one can describe this intervention of God in favour of the good will, and brings us to the theme of grace itself.

---

*et humanae voluntates humanorum operum causae sunt; atque ita, qui omnes rerum causas praescivit, profecto in eis causis etiam nostras voluntates ignorare non potuit, quas nostrorum operum causas esse praescivit* (*De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 138). English translation by M. Dods, 91.

<sup>388</sup> See Cicero, *De fato* 11,25; Plasberg-Ax 141.

<sup>389</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 138 f.

<sup>390</sup> ... *quibusdam tribuit potestates, quibusdam non tribuit ... omnium potestatum dator, non voluntatum ... omnia maxime Dei voluntati subdita sunt, cui etiam voluntates omnes subiciuntur, quia non habent potestatem nisi quam ille concedit* (*De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 139).

<sup>391</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 139.

<sup>392</sup> ... *voluntates nostrae tantum valent, quantum Deus eas valere voluit atque praescivit* (*De civ. Dei* V,9: CCL 47, 140). English translation by M. Dods, 92.

<sup>393</sup> *Multa enim facimus, quae si nollemus, non utique faceremus. Quo primitus pertinet ipsum velle; nam si volumus, est, si nolumus, non est; non enim vellemus, si nollemus* (*De civ. Dei* V,10: CCL 47, 140). English translation by M. Dods, 92.

<sup>394</sup> *De civ. Dei* V,10: CCL 47, 141.



Augustine holds that the separation from God brought about by human sin cannot be overcome by human powers alone, but solely by the grace of God and his mercy: "For, whatever virtue we call our own is itself bestowed upon us by His goodness."<sup>395</sup> In many passages it is said that only grace sets men free from sin and thus from the "second death",<sup>396</sup> and that we were delivered from it by Christ as the one mediator between God and men<sup>397</sup> (pagan mediators, i.e., demons, are not capable of this, says Augustine, because they are worse than men<sup>398</sup>). As the Son of God, the mediator became the Son of man in order that the sons of men, who had lost their position as the sons of God,<sup>399</sup> might become the sons of God again and participate in divinity. What Christ as the Son of God is as a result of his nature, men become through him by grace.<sup>400</sup> Men, born in their nature as citizens of the earthly city (representing the "nature" vitiated by sin), can only become citizens of the heavenly city by being born by grace (with the heavenly city representing the liberating "grace" here).<sup>401</sup>

However, God's intervention in human salvation must also come from "within"; only then can man accept help offered "externally", i.e., from other men.<sup>402</sup> Thus God aids the good human will:<sup>403</sup> his grace, to which men flee for help (*gratia adiuvans*), makes them stronger in their struggle with vice in order that they might be really justified.<sup>404</sup> "The image of God" in man, or the "little spark of reason" (*scintilla rationis*) remains there after the fall, but the virtue of a good life leading to eternal happiness is an exclusive gift

<sup>395</sup> *De civ. Dei* X,22: CCL 47, 296. English translation by M. Dods, 194.

<sup>396</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIII,3: CCL 48, 387; *De civ. Dei* XIII,14: CCL 48, 395 f.; *De civ. Dei* XIV,1: CCL 48, 414; *De civ. Dei* XIV,15: CCL 48, 437; *De civ. Dei* XVI,27: CCL 48, 532.

<sup>397</sup> *De civ. Dei* IX,15: CCL 47, 262 f. It is from this perspective that G. Fidelibus interprets grace in *De civitate Dei*, emphasising incarnation and its continuation in the body of the church throughout history as the way in which God overcame the distance between himself and man and a way to real happiness bestowed on man (see G. Fidelibus, "Grazia e storicità nel disegno del *De civitate Dei*: Un percorso di ragione", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 225–254).

<sup>398</sup> See Augustine's polemic against Apuleius, esp. *De civ. Dei* IX,8–9: CCL 47, 256 ff.

<sup>399</sup> According to Augustine's demythologising exposition of Gen. 6:1–7, the "sons of God", who were endowed with the "grace" of being the sons of God, became mere men, with only "nature" left (*De civ. Dei* XV,23: CCL 48, 490 f.).

<sup>400</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXI,15: CCL 48, 781.

<sup>401</sup> *Parit autem cives terrenae civitatis peccato vitata natura, caelestis vero civitatis cives parit a peccato naturam liberans gratia* (*De civ. Dei* XV,2: CCL 48, 455).

<sup>402</sup> *Spiritus autem sanctus operatur intrinsecus, ut valeat aliquid medicina, quae adhibetur extrinsecus ... Deus ... interiore gratia mentem regat ...* (*De civ. Dei* XV,6: CCL 48, 459).

<sup>403</sup> ... *voluntatum bonarum adiutor* (*De civ. Dei* XIV,26: CCL 48, 450).

<sup>404</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXI,16: CCL 48, 782 f.

of the grace of God in Christ.<sup>405</sup> In another passage it is even said that God works in us directly to will (Phil. 2:13) because sometimes he “wills” in such a way that he causes men to will.<sup>406</sup> The good works of men are thus not theirs, but rather his,<sup>407</sup> as we already know from other works by Augustine, for men would not be able to love true righteousness and find delectation in it (*diligere, delectare*) if the grace of God had not conquered their desire to sin (*peccandi cupiditas*).<sup>408</sup>

In several passages in his account Augustine even makes it clear that man is not only burdened by his previous failure (or rather, by its inherited consequences<sup>409</sup>), but the created will is not able to turn towards the good on its own. Not even in paradise could man live well without God's help, says Augustine:

But even this trusting in God's help could not itself be accomplished without God's help, although man had it in his own power to relinquish the benefits of divine grace by pleasing himself. ... [I]t was not in man's power, even in Paradise, to live as he ought without God's help; but it was in his power to live wickedly, though thus he should cut short his happiness, and incur very just punishment.<sup>410</sup>

It seems as if the fact that it was created out of nothing deprives the will of the possibility of persevering in goodness which was given to it in creation.<sup>411</sup> This notion is also applied to angels,<sup>412</sup> who were in the same situation as the first man: they had not been burdened by any previous failure, but had

<sup>405</sup> ... non in eo tamen penitus extincta est quaedam velut scintilla rationis, in qua factus est ad imaginem Dei. ... artes bene vivendi et ad immortalem perveniendi felicitatem, quae virtutes vocantur et sola Dei gratia, quae in Christo est, filiis promissionis regnique donantur ... (De civ. Dei XXII,24: CCL 48, 847f.).

<sup>406</sup> ... hanc voluntatem, quam Deus operatur in hominibus, etiam velle dicitur, quod non ipse vult, sed suos id volentes facit (De civ. Dei XXII,2: CCL 48, 807).

<sup>407</sup> De civ. Dei XXII,30: CCL 48, 865.

<sup>408</sup> Auget enim prohibitio desiderium operis illiciti, quando iustitia non sic diligitur, ut peccandi cupiditas eius delectatione vincatur. Ut autem diligatur et delectet vera iustitia, non nisi divina subvenit gratia (De civ. Dei XIII,5: CCL 48, 388).

<sup>409</sup> De civ. Dei XVI,27: CCL 48, 531f.; De civ. Dei XVI,35: CCL 48, 540.

<sup>410</sup> Quia et ipsum fidere de adiutorio Dei non quidem posset sine adiutorio Dei, nec tamen ideo ab his divinae gratiae beneficiis sibi placendo recedere non habebat in potestate. ... bene vivere sine adiutorio Dei etiam in paradiso non erat in potestate; erat autem in potestate male vivere, sed beatitudine non permansura et poena iustissima secutura (De civ. Dei XIV,27: CCL 48, 451). English translation by M. Dods, 282.

<sup>411</sup> Quoniam voluntas in natura, quae facta est bona a Deo bono, sed mutabilis ab inmutabili, quia ex nihilo, et a bono potest declinare, ut faciat malum, quod fit libero arbitrio, et a malo, ut faciat bonum, quod non fit sine divino adiutorio (De civ. Dei XV,21: CCL 48, 487).

<sup>412</sup> De civ. Dei XII,1–2: CCL 48, 356f.; De civ. Dei XII,6: CCL 48, 360.

only such features as were given to them by God in the act of creation. However, not even angels were able to turn towards God without his special intervention;<sup>413</sup> they, too, were endowed with the desire of God, and their “nature” had to be assisted by God’s help:

Or if they could not make themselves better than they were made by Him who is surpassed by none in His work, then certainly, without His helpful operation, they could not come to possess that good will which made them better. ... [T]he will, however good it might be, would not have continued to desire Him, had not He who had made their nature out of nothing, and yet capable of enjoying Him, first stimulated it to desire Him, and then filled it with Himself, and so made it better ...<sup>414</sup>

This idea, in fact, significantly modifies the notion of the origin of evil in the will. Evil is no longer brought about by the will, which, having been created out of nothing, *may* (but need not) turn away from what is good, but is attributed to the created nature of the will and its origin in nothing, as a result of which the will *cannot* do well without the intervention of God. It is only the grace of God which may complete the deficiency of the created being as such. I regard such a notion as very precarious, as this would lead to an unfortunate ontologisation of Augustine’s doctrine on grace.

Augustine himself probably did not attempt such an ontologisation (and would presumably have rejected it); his aim was to reveal to men their essential dependence on God, to which they are to give their consent. However, not even this consent is in the power of men alone. But why is it that God did not help men to gain such trust? This brings back the irresolvable mystery of the ill-fated Esau, who was not provided with God’s aid, which would have been indispensable for his salvation. Augustine answers accordingly: God certainly could have helped both men and angels, but he wanted to show “what evil could be wrought by their pride, and what good by His grace”.<sup>415</sup>

---

<sup>413</sup> *Ita quamvis non omnis beata possit esse creatura (neque enim hoc munus adipiscuntur aut capiunt ferae ligna saxa et si quid huius modi est), ea tamen, quae potest, non ex se ipsa potest, quia ex nihilo creata est, sed ex illo, a quo creata est (De civ. Dei XII,1: CCL 48, 355).*

<sup>414</sup> *At si non potuerunt se ipsos facere meliores, quam eos ille fecerat, quo nemo melius quicquam facit: profecto et bonam voluntatem, qua meliores essent, nisi operante adiutorio Creatoris habere non possent. ... voluntatem quamlibet bonam inopem fuisse in solo desiderio remansuram, nisi ille, qui bonam naturam ex nihilo sui capacem fecerat, ex se ipso faceret implendo meliorem, prius faciens excitando avidiorem ... (De civ. Dei XII,9: CCL 48, 363).* English translation after M. Dods, 231.

<sup>415</sup> *Quis enim audeat credere aut dicere, ut neque angelus neque homo caderet, in Dei potestate non fuisse? Sed hoc eorum potestati maluit non auferre atque ita, et quantum mali eorum superbia et quantum boni sua gratia valeret, ostendere (De civ. Dei XIV,27: CCL 48, 451).*

The two cities of angels and men, formed by two “loves”, thus come out of two intentions of God: for one thing, he wanted to demonstrate through the love given to some (*amor Dei*) that created beings can only break away from their deficiency by giving consent to their dependence on God; for another, he aimed to show by means of the distorted love of others (*amor sui*) what the created beings are condemned to as a result of the fact they are created, which causes the perversion of the will. The contempt of self (*contemptus sui*), brought forth by the love of God,<sup>416</sup> then probably means accepting one’s own dependence and constitutive contingency and the nothingness lying at the bottom of each created being.

Like in other works, it remains unexplained here to which of these two demonstration groups each man belongs and why; Augustine just settles for the observation that not all are endowed with grace,<sup>417</sup> and, for that matter, nobody deserves it anyway.<sup>418</sup> The two cities, “of which the one is predestined to reign eternally with God, and the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil”,<sup>419</sup> date back to Adam’s first children, Cain and Abel, of whom the former was elected by grace, and the other left in the “mass” of perdition as a vessel of dishonour.

Both cities are entangled together in this world, as we already know, and their limits do not correspond to the limits of the present church. Not all the men of whom “the Christian churches are full now” belong to the city of God. Only in the time to come will both cities be separated permanently by God according to his eternal plan.<sup>420</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, God with his almighty will<sup>421</sup> has apparently not decided to give salvation to everybody, as Origen, who believed in the renewal and salvation of all, including the devil, seemed to hold.<sup>422</sup>

Augustine’s monumental work is thus not only a polemic against the pagan religion and the religious ambition of the Roman state, but also an imposing dualism of grace and condemnation, developed into an epopee of two cities going through the history of mankind. These cities, which are

<sup>416</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIV,28: CCL 48, 451.

<sup>417</sup> *De civ. Dei* IX,21: CCL 47, 268; *De civ. Dei* XIII,23: CCL 48, 406 f.; *De civ. Dei* XIV,26: CCL 48, 450.

<sup>418</sup> *De civ. Dei* XIV,1: CCL 48, 414; *De civ. Dei* XXI,24: CCL 48, 792.

<sup>419</sup> ... *quas etiam mystice appellamus civitates duas, hoc est duas societates hominum, quarum est una quae praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum Deo, altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo* (*De civ. Dei* XV,1: CCL 48, 453).

<sup>420</sup> *De civ. Dei* XVIII,48: CCL 48, 647.

<sup>421</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXI,5: CCL 48, 766.

<sup>422</sup> *De civ. Dei* XXI,17: CCL 48, 783.

to be separated for good at the end of time, result from the choice and accomplishment or failure of each created being; however, the choice itself comes out of the twofold divine intention of showing what created beings are in themselves and what they are through the freely given gift of grace. Thus even the failures of men and angels have, according to Augustine, their place in the divine plan; moreover, he finds an aesthetic justification for them: the universe is beautiful, even with sinners, just as the beauty of a picture is increased by dark colours,<sup>423</sup> and the course of ages is like an exquisite poem in which antitheses contribute to the beauty of the whole.<sup>424</sup>

### 2.10. *Correspondence with the Monks of Hadrumetum and Gaul*

Augustine's late works against the "semi-Pelagians" (as they are sometimes called) include two pairs of works and covering letters addressed to Abbot Valentinus and his monks from the African monastery of Hadrumetum, and to Prosper and Hilary from Gaul. Roughly speaking, Augustine has to face the question of whether human efforts are worthy at all if God determines human destinies, both the temporal and eternal ones, with his grace, which is not bestowed according to these efforts.<sup>425</sup>

#### 2.10a. *The Gift of Will*

(De gratia et libero arbitrio, De correptione et gratia)

The point of departure of the works addressed to Abbot Valentinus (from between 426 and 427), whose brothers were disturbed by Augustine's doctrine on grace presented in the letter to Sixtus (*Ep.* 194),<sup>426</sup> is the question of

<sup>423</sup> *De civ. Dei* XI,23: CCL 48, 342.

<sup>424</sup> *De civ. Dei* XI,18: CCL 48, 337. On Augustine's aesthetic employment of evil and its punishment in the order of the universe, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L'ordre*, 332–335, 442–445.

<sup>425</sup> On the addressees of these works and the continuing Gallic dispute over Augustine's heritage after his death, see R.H. Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency. A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*, Macon 1996; M. Vessey, "Opus imperfectum. Augustine and His Readers, 426–435 A.D.", in: *VCh* 52, 1998, 264–285; D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen. The Relationship between Grace and Free Will in the Discussion of Augustine with the so-called Semipelagians*, Leuven 2003.

<sup>426</sup> See above, p. 163 incl. n. 18 and p. 210 f. On the anthropology of this letter, which provoked a crisis in Hadrumetum, where, according to V. Grossi, Pelagian ideas had their influence, and the anthropology of Augustine's treatise *De libero arbitrio et gratia*, see V. Grossi, "La crisi antropologica nel monastero di Adrumento", in: *Augustinianum*, 19, 1979, 103–133. On the disturbances in the monastery of Hadrumetum, see also D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen*, 28–41.

how to defend the importance of the free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) and grace at the same time.<sup>427</sup> The significance of the free choice of the will follows from Scripture, which gives commands to men and promises a reward for their actions. Men thus decide on their own what life they will choose (Ecclus. 15:18), and they cannot blame their ignorance or weakness.<sup>428</sup> On the other hand, it is true that the commandments can only be fulfilled with the help of the grace of God, without which no good works are possible. Each good deed (e.g. the decision to become a monk) is thus both a gift of grace and a result of a human choice.<sup>429</sup>

Scripture commands men to do even what cannot be done without the aid of grace (“Do not be overcome by evil”, Rom. 12:21). This is the dialectic of the law and grace which we already know from Augustine’s previous works. Unless aided by grace, the law on its own remains a letter which kills, because it cannot be complied with.<sup>430</sup> Fulfilling the law can only be bestowed by the Holy Spirit on the grounds of one’s faith, which is a freely given divine gift as well. Out of pure grace and irrespective of human deeds, God first causes the conversion or justification of men (e.g. the conversion of the apostle Paul) and then endows their faith with grace, which supports the good acts of the human will. These are not done by men alone or God alone, but, in the words of the apostle, by “the grace of God which was with me” (1 Cor. 15:10).<sup>431</sup>

Now, how do the workings of grace and the will cooperate in human good works? We already know Augustine’s answer to this question. Men do good works of their own will, but the will is given to them by God: “It is certain that we will when we will, but he causes us to will what is good, of whom were said ..., *The will is prepared by the Lord* (Prov. 8:35 LXX)”.<sup>432</sup> Even faith

<sup>427</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 1,1: BA 24, 90.

<sup>428</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 2,2–3,5: BA 24, 92–104.

<sup>429</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 4,6–7: BA 24, 104–108.

<sup>430</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 4,8: BA 24, 110.

<sup>431</sup> *Non ego autem, sed gratia Dei mecum: id est, non solus, sed gratia Dei mecum: ac per hoc nec gratia Dei sola, nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo. Ut autem de caelo vocaretur, et tam magna efficacissima vocatione converteretur, gratia Dei erat sola; quia merita eius erant magna, sed mala. ... His et talibus testimoniis divinis probatur, gratiam Dei non secundum merita nostra dari: quandoquidem non solum nullis bonis, verum etiam multis meritis malis praecedentibus videmus datam, et quotidie dari videmus. Sed plane cum data fuerint, incipiunt esse etiam merita nostra bona, per illam tamen: nam si se illa subtraxerit, cadit homo, non erectus, sed praecipitatus libero arbitrio. Quapropter nec quando coeperit homo habere merita bona, debet sibi tribuere illa, sed Deo* (*De grat. lib. arb.* 5,12–6,13: BA 24, 118–120).

<sup>432</sup> *Certum est nos velle, cum volumus; sed ille facit ut velimus bonum, de quo dictum est, quod paulo ante posui: Praeparatur voluntas a Domino* (*De grat. lib. arb.* 16,32: BA 24, 162–164). English translation by R.J. Teske, 93.

or, in other words, the will itself is grace; it is not only God's reaction to the preceding faith-will of man.<sup>433</sup> Therefore, grace is not given according to the merits of the will, but it brings about the good will, or, to be more precise, it turns the evil will of men into a good one. Man always has a free will (*voluntas libera*), but it may either be "free from sin" (i.e., good) or "free from righteousness" (i.e., evil) (*a peccato*, and *a iustitia libera*, respectively).<sup>434</sup> It is turned towards the good by grace in the form of love, which is the only thing that can fulfil God's commandments.<sup>435</sup> God thus has the orientation of the human will in his hands, inclining it where he wills, either by gratuitous grace towards the good, or by punishing justice towards evil:

... God works in the hearts of human beings to incline their wills to whatever he wills, whether to good actions in accord with his mercy or to evil ones in accord with their merits.<sup>436</sup>

A man acting of his own will is, at the same time, controlled by God himself, who gives him good movements of the will and love, or fear, delusion and a hardened heart.<sup>437</sup> The best way to use the free choice of the will is to ask God to help one do what he commands, i.e., to ask for a sufficiently strong will.<sup>438</sup>

Therefore, it is God who is the ultimate agent of human good deeds. That is why the eternal reward for human good deeds is "grace for grace" (John 1:16) rather than "the wages of righteousness" (*stipendium iustitiae*; a modification of Rom. 6:23).<sup>439</sup> God crowns his own gifts: "If, then, your good merits are God's gifts, God does not crown your merits as your merits, but as His own gifts."<sup>440</sup>

<sup>433</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 14,28: BA 24, 150–152.

<sup>434</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 15,31: BA 24, 158–160. In *De corrept.* 13,42: CSEL 92, 271, Augustine mentions the free, but not freed choice of the will (*arbitrium ... liberum sed non liberatum*), which is "free from righteousness, but enslaved by sin" (*liberum iustitiae peccati autem servum*).

<sup>435</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 17,34: BA 24, 168; *De grat. lib. arb.* 17,37: BA 24, 174.

<sup>436</sup> ... *operari Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quocumque voluerit, sive ad bona pro sua misericordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum* (*De grat. lib. arb.* 21,43: BA 24, 196). English translation by R.J. Teske, 102.

<sup>437</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 21,42: BA 24, 190–194; *De grat. lib. arb.* 23,45: BA 24, 202.

<sup>438</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 15,31: BA 24, 158–160.

<sup>439</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 9,21: BA 24, 134–136. For a complete exposition of the issue, see *De grat. lib. arb.* 8,19–20: BA 24, 130–134.

<sup>440</sup> *Si ergo Dei dona sunt bona merita tua, non Deus coronat merita tua tanquam merita tua, sed tanquam dona sua* (*De grat. lib. arb.* 6,15: BA 24, 124). English translation by R.J. Teske, 81. With respect to this purport of the treatise, it is rather surprising that N.W. den Bok employs it ("Freedom", 240–247) to make a distinction between *voluntas* as the overall voluntary

Augustine does not forget to give a warning against the ideas of the Pelagians, according to whom grace is the nature in which men were created (i.e., rationality as the image of God in men), and is thus given to all men in the same degree, for all, because of their nature, are capable of righteousness. Were it true, says Augustine, the law would not have to be fulfilled in Christ, and Christ died in vain.<sup>441</sup>

Not all the objections of Valentinus' monks are answered in this treatise. If the best contribution of men to their own good deeds through the free choice of the will consists in asking God for a sufficiently strong will, what is the point in rebuking others for their faults (*correptio*)? As only God may cause their wills to turn, would it not be more efficacious to pray for them instead?<sup>442</sup> And is it possible at all to rebuke anyone for not having what they cannot have without the freely given assistance of grace?<sup>443</sup> For example, when someone is endowed with the gift of faith, but not with the gift of perseverance to the end of his days (*perseverantia*), how can he be rebuked?<sup>444</sup>

As Augustine has it in the second treatise addressed to Abbot Valentinus,<sup>445</sup> even a rebuke may bring about the renewal of the will (because God may employ it as a part of his plan),<sup>446</sup> and such a man who, of his own will, changed from a good to an evil life certainly deserves a rebuke.<sup>447</sup> It is true that perseverance in faith is God's gift, not a merit of the free choice of the will, and God confers it according to his predestination;<sup>448</sup> on the other hand,

---

inclination and *liberum arbitrium* as a partial movement of acceptance or consent which can be given to or can be withheld from this or that; he thus aims to prove that the role of *liberum arbitrium* as a genuinely human choice prevails. I am afraid that the text (or the previous development of Augustine's thinking as we have followed it until now) does not justify such a conclusion. Even if Augustine did make an actual distinction between the two aspects of the will (he does not make a consistent terminological distinction, though), he takes the view—one he reached in his answer to Simplicianus—that the will does remain the will (it does not become a mechanical cause), but it is bestowed on men. The same conclusion (which he evaluates rather differently than myself) is reached by T.L. Holtzen, "The Therapeutic Nature of Grace in St. Augustine's *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*", in: *AugSt* 2000, 93–115, esp. 98 f., n. 19.

<sup>441</sup> *De grat. lib. arb.* 13,25: BA 24, 146–148.

<sup>442</sup> *Retract.* II,67: CCL 57, 142. On the meaning of *correptio* in Augustine and in the ecclesiastical use, see V. Grossi, "*Correptio—correctio—emendatio* in Agostino d'Ippona. Terminologia penitenziale e monastica", in: *Augustinianum*, 38, 1998, 215–222, esp. 215–219.

<sup>443</sup> *De corrept.* 4,6: CSEL 92, 223.

<sup>444</sup> *De corrept.* 6,10: CSEL 92, 227 f.

<sup>445</sup> A part of the manuscript tradition regarded both works as one whole; see G. Folliet, "Introduction", in: CSEL 92, 130.

<sup>446</sup> *De corrept.* 6,9: CSEL 92, 227.

<sup>447</sup> *De corrept.* 7,11: CSEL 92, 231.

<sup>448</sup> *De corrept.* 7,13–16: CSEL 92, 233–237.



perseverance is also an act of the will. However, even the will is a gift of God, as has already been mentioned, and it is thus God who makes the will really free (*libertas voluntatis*) in order that it might persevere:

The human will does not, of course, obtain grace by its freedom; it rather obtains freedom by grace and, in order that it may persevere, it obtains a delightful permanence and an insuperable strength.<sup>449</sup>

Apparently, says Augustine, this gift of perseverance was not bestowed on the first man, because he did commit sin. But why is it that he was not endowed with it, as he could not yet have been punished as a member of the “mass of perdition”?<sup>450</sup> Augustine maintains that the first man was assisted by grace to the extent that he could have persevered in good if he had wanted to—but he did not and forsook the assistance by his own free choice. He was not yet endowed with the wanting itself, which became part of the grace of the second Adam. God provided him with assistance so that he could persist if he wanted to, but not with assistance in wanting. But even this help was lost to Adam as a result of his sin, and thus to the whole human race:

The first man did not have this grace by which he would never have willed to be evil, but he certainly had the grace in which, if he willed to remain, he would never have been evil and without which he could not have been good even with free choice, though he could have abandoned it through free choice. Nor did God will that Adam should be without his grace, which he left to his free choice. For free choice is sufficient for evil, but not sufficient for good, unless it is helped by the omnipotent good. If that man had not abandoned this help through free choice, he would always have been good, but he abandoned it and was in turn abandoned. This help was, of course, such that he could abandon it if he willed to and could remain in it if he willed to, not such that it would make him to will this.<sup>451</sup>

---

<sup>449</sup> *Voluntas quippe humana non libertate consequitur gratiam sed gratia potius libertatem, et ut perseveret delectabilem perpetuitatem et insuperabilem fortitudinem* (*De corrept.* 8,17: CSEL 92, 238). English translation by R.J. Teske, 120.

<sup>450</sup> *De corrept.* 10,26: CSEL 92, 249 f.

<sup>451</sup> *Istam gratiam non habuit homo primus, qua numquam esse vellet malus; sed sane habuit, in qua si permanere vellet, numquam malus esset, et sine qua etiam cum libero arbitrio bonus esse non posset, sed eam tamen per liberum arbitrium deserere posset. Nec ipsum ergo Deus esse voluit sine sua gratia, quem reliquit in eius libero arbitrio. Quoniam liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit, ad bonum autem parum est, nisi adiuvetur ab omnipotenti bono. Quod adiutorium si homo ille per liberum non deseruisset arbitrium, semper esset bonus; sed deseruit, et desertus est. Tale quippe erat adiutorium quod desereret cum vellet et in quo permaneret si vellet, non quo fieret ut vellet* (*De corrept.* 11,31: CSEL 92, 255). English translation by R.J. Teske, 132 f. See the whole passage *De corrept.* 11,31–32: CSEL 92, 255–259.

The aid originally given to Adam thus made it possible for him “to be able not to sin” (*posse non peccare*), “to be able not to die” (*posse non mori*), conditioned by his will, and “to be able not to forsake the good” (*bonum posse non deserere*). On the other hand, the grace which God bestows on the elect consists not in the ability but inability to do something: they are “not able to sin” (*non posse peccare*), “not able to die” (*non posse mori*), and “not able to forsake the good” (*bonum non posse deserere*); this, however, will only be realised in eternity.<sup>452</sup> For the time being, this grace is manifested not only as a gift of the ability (*posse*), but also the will (*velle*) to persevere, which apparently Adam did not possess. The invincible will of God may make even a weak human will so persistent that it really perseveres:

For the first grace brought it about that the man had righteousness if he willed to; the second, therefore, is more powerful, for it makes one even to will and to will so strongly and to love with such ardor that by the will of the spirit one conquers the pleasure of the flesh which has contrary desires (*carnis voluptatem contraria concupiscentem*).<sup>453</sup>

This, however, involves only a fixed number of the elect, and nobody can be certain whether he belongs there. This keeps all men in fear and does away with their certainty, which otherwise might engender pride, says Augustine.<sup>454</sup>

The aid in perseverance bestowed on God’s elect is not only necessary (*adiutorium sine quo non*: such as food, without which we cannot live)—this is the aid which was given the first man—but also sufficient (*adiutorium quo*: such as blessedness, which in itself brings about blessedness).<sup>455</sup> Those elected by God cannot be condemned (and those not elected cannot be saved, one might infer), for no man can resist God’s will with his own will because the human will is in the power of God:

---

<sup>452</sup> *De corrept.* 12,33: CSEL 92, 259. As F.-J. Thonnard points out, Augustine does not regard Christian freedom as a return to the free choice of the first man between good and evil, but as participation in the sovereign freedom of God himself, free from the possibility of evil (see F.-J. Thonnard, “La notion”).

<sup>453</sup> *Prima [gratia] est enim qua fit ut habeat homo iustitiam si velit; secunda ergo plus potest, qua etiam fit ut velit, et tantum velit tantoque ardore diligit, ut carnis voluptatem contraria concupiscentem voluntate spiritus vincat* (*De corrept.* 11,31: CSEL 92, 256 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 130.

<sup>454</sup> *De corrept.* 13,39–40: CSEL 92, 267–269.

<sup>455</sup> *De corrept.* 12,34: CSEL 92, 259 f. On this distinction of double aid, which is of Stoic origin, see A. Solignac, “La condition”, 362, n. 12 (see Cicero, *Topica*, 15,58–59; Riccio Coletti 77 f.; *De fato*, 16,36; Plasberg-Ax 146 f.).

One should, therefore, have no doubt that human wills cannot resist the will of God who in heaven and on earth has done everything he willed (cf. Ps. 134[135]:6), and who has brought about even those things which are in the future (cf. Isa. 45:11 LXX). Human wills cannot resist his will so that he does not do what he wills, since he does what he wills and when he wills even with the very wills of human beings.<sup>456</sup>

And even a man who does what God does not will is an instrument of God and will not eventually escape his punishing will.<sup>457</sup>

The New Testament account of a God who wills all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4) should only be applied to God's elect, says Augustine. "All" thus means "all the predestined" here.<sup>458</sup> It is unthinkable that God might wish all men to be saved but his will was not efficacious, because no man can thwart the will of God.<sup>459</sup>

---

<sup>456</sup> *Non est itaque dubitandum, voluntati Dei qui in coelo et in terra omnia quaecumque voluit fecit et qui etiam illa quae futura sunt fecit, humanas voluntates non posse resistere, quominus faciat ipse quod vult, quandoquidem etiam de ipsis hominum voluntatibus quod vult cum vult, facit* (*De corrept.* 14.45: CSEL 92, 273). English translation by R.J. Teske, pp. 139 f. See also *De corrept.* 12.38–13.39: CSEL 92, 265–267.

<sup>457</sup> *De corrept.* 14.43: CSEL 92, 272.

<sup>458</sup> *Et quod scriptum est, quod omnes homines vult salvos fieri* (1 Tim. 2:4), *nec tamen omnes salvi fiunt ... Ita dictum est: Omnes homines vult salvos fieri, ut intelligantur omnes praedestinati* (*De corrept.* 14.44: CSEL 92, 272).

<sup>459</sup> *De corrept.* 14.44–45: CSEL 92, 272 f. The development of Augustine's interpretation of the line in 1 Tim. 2:4 is followed by A. Solignac, "Les excès", 836 f.; D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen*, 357–366. On Augustine's "perverse reading" of this line, see also J.M. Rist, "Augustine", 437–439, who rightly rejects the aim of other scholars of mitigating Augustine's interpretation: e.g. A. Sage, "La prédestination chez saint Augustin d'après une thèse récente", in: *REAug* 6, 1960, 31–40, esp. 37 n. 12 (this article criticises V. Boublik's dissertation, *La predestinazione*, in which Augustine's teaching on predestination is rejected as non-biblical); idem, "Les deux temps de grâce", in: *REAug* 7, 1961, 229 (here A. Sage discusses the difference between the grace of "being able not to sin" as *adiutorium sine quo non*, bestowed on Adam before the fall, and the grace of "not being able to sin" as *adiutorium quo*, given in Christ; however, he does not raise the question of why the latter grace, which includes the gift of the will, is not bestowed upon all men); F.-J. Thonnard, "La prédestination augustinienne. Sa place en philosophie augustinienne", in: *REAug* 10, 1964, 97–123 (the author characterises Augustine's doctrine on predestination as "optimistic" and "universalistic", counting on the "free cooperation of the elect ones" and the "absolute responsibility of the condemned ones"; 119 *et passim*). Augustine's concept of predestination was also advocated (against Boublik) by R. Bernard, who, quite one-sidedly, accentuates its collective anti-individualistic aspect (see R. Bernard, "La prédestination du Christ total selon saint Augustin", in: *RechAug* 3, 1965, 1–58). On the contrary, H. Rondet admits that Augustine's expositions in the treatise *De corrept.* (by which the Jansenists were inspired later on), are "evidently indefensible today" (« évidemment indéfendable aujourd'hui »); see H. Rondet, "La prédestination augustinienne. Genèse d'une doctrine", in: *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, 18, 1966, 229–251, 249. On the

It is unfathomable and incomprehensible to men why God endows one with the will to persevere and not another,<sup>460</sup> and yet (or, perhaps, for that reason) all must be rebuked and the salvation of all is to be wished for. The will of God to save all men may also mean, says Augustine, that God enables us to wish for salvation and contribute to it, for example by a brotherly rebuke.<sup>461</sup> In the case of some men, God himself will turn the rebuke into mercy and change their wills; for others he will turn it into judgement and leave their wills hardened.<sup>462</sup> God's predestination is infallible and unchangeable; however, it is possible to rebuke someone for being negligent in rebuking: "the son of perdition" will surely die in any case, but God will "require [his blood] at the hand of the watchman" (Ezek. 3:18).<sup>463</sup>

In Augustine's account for the monks of Hadrumetum, man is actually a puppet in the hands of God that may be rebuked for many things he cannot really change unless God predestined it so before the world was created.<sup>464</sup>

---

other hand, an anti-Jansenist analysis of the treatise is given by J. Schmucker, who interprets Augustine's position along the lines that all people have been given at least the same grace as Adam (*adiutorum sine quo non*), and it is their fault when they do not use it (see J. Schmucker, *Die Gnade des Urstandes und die Gnade der Auserwählten in Augustins De correptione et gratia*, Metten 1940, 41–67; on Arnould's interpretation, see *ibid.* 94–97). In my opinion, however, such an interpretation is not substantiated by the text. "An open contradiction" ("ein offenkundiger Widerspruch") or "paradoxicality" ("Paradoxie") of Augustine's theological speculation in this treatise is also acknowledged by G. Nygren (*Das Prädestinationsproblem*, 85f.), who, nevertheless, attempts a positive interpretation in terms of a "relative" freedom of men and donated merit (*ibid.* 286–288).

<sup>460</sup> *De corrept.* 8,18: CSEL 92, 239.

<sup>461</sup> *De corrept.* 15,47: CSEL 92, 277 f.

<sup>462</sup> *De corrept.* 9,25: CSEL 92, 249; *De corrept.* 14,43: CSEL 92, 271 f.

<sup>463</sup> *De corrept.* 16,48–49: CSEL 92, 278 f.

<sup>464</sup> As C. Boyer has it ("Le système de saint Augustin sur la grâce. Paraphrase du *De correptione et gratia*", in: *RechSR* 20, 1930, 481–505), the existence of predestination and the guilt of those who perish are two sides of a secret, both of which must be kept (504). Similarly, R. Garrigou-Lagrange ("La grâce efficace et la grâce suffisante selon Saint Augustin", in: *Angelicum*, 31, 1954, 243–251) finds a "great secret" in Augustine's teaching on the efficacy of grace, though one which keeps the "balance of wisdom" (250). As A. Solignac points out, Augustine's works addressed to the monks of Hadrumetum manifest his thinking "in all its succinctness and severity". The author admits that Augustine "goes too far" in his insistence on human weakness and the sovereign power of God's grace, but he is convinced that when approaching the works with "unreserved humility" («une humilité sans réserve»), readers may discover the real aim of Augustine, which is to show that "grace does not suppress, but *transforms* freedom, for it endows it with generosity capable of transcending its own weakness" (A. Solignac, "Les excès", 840–842). I must admit that I still miss such humility.

2.10b. *Grace and Predestination*

(De praedestinatione sanctorum, De dono perseverantiae)

In his works<sup>465</sup> from the period 428–429, addressed several months later to Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary, Augustine does not retreat from his position. He faces the ideas of a group of Gallic monks led by Abbot Cassian and probably centred in Marseilles (later in Lérins, headed by his disciples), who, unlike the Pelagians, do not reject inherited sin or God's assistance to the will in wanting good, but are wrong in the issue of predestination and regard faith as an act of the free choice of the will, which is not preceded by grace, but followed by it.<sup>466</sup>

As an heir to the ascetical experience of the desert fathers, Cassian maintains that grace must support the free choice of the will, which in itself is too "weak" (*liberi arbitrii infirmitas*). Without God's aid, human effort is inefficacious as its beginning and its completion are bestowed by grace. Nevertheless, between the given beginning and end there remains a middle space

<sup>465</sup> On the background of the origin of these treatises and the monastic environment of southern Gaul, see also D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen*, 91–108.

<sup>466</sup> *De praed. sanct.* 1,2–2,3: *BA* 24, 466–468. On the traditional Western theological evaluation of the "semi-Pelagians", see J. Chéné, "Que signifiaient *initium fidei* et *affectus credulitatis* pour les semipélagiens?", in: *RechSR* 35, 1948, 566–588; idem, "Le semipélagianisme du midi de la Gaule d'après les lettres de Prosper d'Aquitaine et d'Hilaire à saint Augustin", in: *RechSR* 43, 1955, 321–341. The author holds that the "semi-Pelagians" regarded as an act of human initiative not only the "beginning" of faith, but faith itself. On the contrary, S. Taranto attempts to show that Cassian's notion of grace cannot be regarded as "semi-Pelagian", as Prosper of Aquitaine wrongly suggests, because it does not include the conviction that men are able to want the good without the aid of grace, but only involves a kind of desire for it (ineffective in itself), which, however, does not qualify as a merit. In Taranto's opinion, Cassian's ideas thus more or less correspond to Augustine's position, while Prosper "rigidly" misinterprets the positions of both (see S. Taranto, "Giovanni Cassiano e Agostino: la dottrina della grazia", in: C. Badilata—J. Attila, eds., *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Actes du colloque international organisé par le New Europe College en collaboration avec la Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft, Bucarest 27–28 septembre 2001*, Paris 2003, 65–132). Cassian as "a discreet and a tactful admirer of Augustine" is also introduced e.g. by A.M.C. Casiday ("Cassian, Augustine, and *De incarnatione*", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 41–47); the Anglo-Saxon discussion presenting Cassian as an anti-Pelagian is summarised by M. Hanby (*Augustine and Modernity*, 107 ff., 230 f.; a hypothesis concerning Cassian's contact with Bishop Lazarus of Aix, who brought formal charges against Pelagius in Diospolis [see above, III,1,5] was already proposed by H.-I. Marrou, "Jean Cassien à Marseille", in: *Revue du Moyen Age latin*, 1, 1945, 1–26). Agreeable though the aim of Cassian's rehabilitation is, it cannot be denied that his notion of the relationship between God's will and those of humans differs from that of Augustine and can be regarded as a significant emendation of it: its "pelagianization", according to M. Hanby (*ibid.*) or its justified correction, according to D. Ogliari (*Gratia et Certamen*, 128–153 and 265–298). For an overview of the scholarly debates, see also D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen*, 10–14.

for human decision (*quaedam medietas interest*).<sup>467</sup> According to Cassian's *Collatio* 13 (which can be understood as a reply to the Augustinian concept of grace<sup>468</sup>), God's grace and the free choice of the will make up a hardly distinguishable union (*indiscrete permixta atque confusa*), and it would thus be erroneous to attribute the beginning of the good will (*initium bonae voluntatis*) to one or the other only.<sup>469</sup> Grace "cooperates with our good will", but it is still "gratuitous", for not only is it immeasurable with respect to our insignificant effort,<sup>470</sup> but it may sometimes be given to those who did not will it.<sup>471</sup> It is therefore not limited by human merits, although it is not given to all men alike, but to each man according to his faith.<sup>472</sup> However, it would be a mistake to presume that God created men so that they could merely will evil and to praise God's grace to such an extent that men would only be left with a desire for evil.<sup>473</sup> But above all, it would be quite fallacious to think that God does not want to save all men, but only some, and thus provides the aid of his grace to certain men only.<sup>474</sup>

As Augustine himself admits, this position is very similar to his own from the period of his presbyterate, before Cyprian's account drew his attention to Paul's question: "And what do you have that you did not receive?" (1 Cor. 4:7) and before he was "overcome" by God's grace in his answer to Simplicianus based on Romans 9.<sup>475</sup>

What Augustine wants to revise in his doctrine after thirty-five years is not so much the notion that faith is a matter of the will; instead, he adds that even this will is bestowed by grace. The ability to have faith (*posse habere fidem*) is certainly part of human nature, but its realisation (i.e., the will which carries out the ability) is a gift of grace. Human nature, which is given to good and evil men alike, must be complemented by grace, which distinguishes good men from evil ones.<sup>476</sup>

<sup>467</sup> *Coll.* 3,12: SC 42, 155–157; see also the whole passage in *Coll.* 3,11–22: SC 42, 155–165.

<sup>468</sup> *Coll.* 13: SC 54, 147–181. See O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, Cambridge 1968<sup>2</sup>, esp. 110–136. D. Ogliari (*Gratia et Certamen*, 97 and 133) regards *Collatio* 13 as Cassian's reply to Augustine's *De correptione et gratia*; for a different opinion, see R.H. Weaver, *Divine Grace*, 71 and 106.

<sup>469</sup> *Coll.* 13,11: SC 54, 162.

<sup>470</sup> *Coll.* 13,13: SC 54, 168.

<sup>471</sup> *Coll.* 13,17–18: SC 54, 178–180.

<sup>472</sup> *Coll.* 13,15–16: SC 54, 174–176.

<sup>473</sup> *Coll.* 13,12: SC 54, 164–166.

<sup>474</sup> *Coll.* 13,7: SC 54, 154–156.

<sup>475</sup> *De praed. sanct.* 3,7: BA 24, 478; *De praed. sanct.* 4,8: BA 24, 484–486. On the shift in Augustine's position, see T.G. Ring, "Der Anfang des Glaubens: Verdienst oder Gnade?", in: *Augustiniana*, 54, 2004, 177–202.

<sup>476</sup> *Proinde posse habere fidem, sicut posse habere charitatem, naturae est hominum: habere*

Because God bestows the will-faith on those he himself chooses, his foreknowledge of those who will convert is not an impersonal knowledge of the future human will, but a genuine predestination: God foreknows and predestines what he himself will do when he bestows the will on men.<sup>477</sup> Strictly speaking, it cannot be said that his voice is not heard by those who do not want to: if it is God who confers the will, then he himself probably does not want to be heard by them.<sup>478</sup>

In his predestination, God made the “preparation for grace” before the creation of the world in order that he might bestow it on his chosen ones (*praedestinatio est gratiae praeparatio, gratia vero iam ipsa donatio*).<sup>479</sup> Predestination is thus the “preparation for grace”, while grace is the “effect” (*effectus*) of that predestination. On the other hand, sin is not predestined by God; he only foreknows it (*praescientia*) and allows it to happen, usually as a punishment.<sup>480</sup>

The grace of God, prepared in predestination, is therefore manifested as a gift of an efficacious will in the sense of faith and an efficacious will to good deeds. In this way, God works in us what he commands us to do. Man, on the other hand, cannot influence God with his will or deeds in any way.<sup>481</sup>

The freely given grace of God is demonstrated through the example of newborn infants, some of whom receive baptism and some do not before they die not because of their future merits foreknown by God (as men are judged according to what they have actually done), but according to the

---

*autem fidem quemadmodum habere charitatem, gratiae est fidelium. Illa itaque natura, in qua nobis data est possibilitas habendi fidem, non discernit ab homine hominem: ipsa vero fides discernit ab infideli fidelem. ... non quia credere vel non credere non est in arbitrio voluntatis humanae, sed in electis praeparatur voluntas a Domino (Prov. 8:35 LXX). Ideo ad ipsam quoque fidem, quae in voluntate est, pertinet: Quis enim te discernit? Quid autem habes quod non accepisti (1 Cor. 4:7)? (De praed. sanct. 5,10: BA 24, 496).*

<sup>477</sup> *De praed. sanct. 9,18: BA 24, 520.*

<sup>478</sup> *Cum igitur Evangelium praedicatur, quidam credunt, quidam non credunt; sed qui credunt, praedicatore forinsecus insonante, intus a Patre audiunt atque discunt; qui autem non credunt, foris audiunt, intus non audiunt neque discunt: hoc est, illis datur ut credant, illis non datur (De praed. sanct. 8,15: BA 24, 512).*

<sup>479</sup> *De praed. sanct. 10,19: BA 24, 522.*

<sup>480</sup> *... praedestinatio est, quae sine praescientia non potest esse; potest autem esse sine praedestinatione praescientia. Praedestinatione quippe Deus ea praescivit, quae fuerat ipse factururus ... Praescire autem potens est etiam quae ipse non facit; sicut quaecumque peccata: quia etsi sunt quaedam, quae ita peccata sunt, ut poenae sint etiam peccatorum ... non ibi peccatum Dei est, sed iudicium. Quocirca praedestinatio Dei quae in bono est, gratiae est, ut dixi, praeparatio; gratia vero est ipsius praedestinationis effectus (De praed. sanct. 10,19: BA 24, 522).*

<sup>481</sup> *De praed. sanct. 10,19: BA 24, 524.*

gratuitous grace of God, or his judgement, which punishes “original sin” (*originale peccatum, meritum originis*).<sup>482</sup>

This grace is most evident in the little ones; since some of them come to the end of this life after being baptized and others without having been baptized, they sufficiently reveal mercy and judgment, mercy that is, of course, gratuitous and judgment that is deserved.<sup>483</sup>

Christ in his humanity is another instance of predestination and the freely given grace (*praeclarissimum lumen praedestinationis et gratiae*). The man Jesus could not have deserved the high level of grace he was endowed with, namely his being assumed with the Son of God into unity of person:

There is also the most brilliant beacon of predestination and of grace, the savior himself, the very mediator between God and human beings, the man Jesus Christ. By what preceding merits of his, either of works or of faith, did the human nature which is in him obtain such a dignity? Please reply! How did he merit to be assumed by the Word coeternal to the Father into the unity of his person and to be the only-begotten Son of God? What good on his part or what sort of good came first? What did he do beforehand, what did he believe, what did he ask for that he attained this ineffable excellence?<sup>484</sup>

It was no merit of his own that his mother was “full of grace” (Luke 1:28), that he was born through the gift of the Holy Spirit and thus saved from the inherited guilt of the human race. Through the gift of God he did not even sin with his will, although it was entirely free.<sup>485</sup> The man Christ as the founder of the new race and the “head” of the church is also a paradigm of grace for others: the same grace as the man Jesus Christ received is also bestowed on

---

<sup>482</sup> ... *originale peccatum: quo sive soluto per Dei gratiam, sive per Dei iudicium non soluto, cum moriuntur infantes, aut merito regenerationis transeunt ex malis ad bona, aut merito originis transeunt ex malis ad mala* (*De praed. sanct.* 12,24: BA 24, 534–536).

<sup>483</sup> ... *quae [gratia] maxime apparet in parvulis, quorum cum alii baptizati, alii non baptizati vitae huius terminum sumunt, satis indicant misericordiam et iudicium: misericordiam quidem gratuitam, iudicium debitum* (*De praed. sanct.* 14,29: BA 24, 550). English translation by R.J. Teske, 173.

<sup>484</sup> *Est etiam praeclarissimum lumen praedestinationis et gratiae, ipse Salvator, ipse Mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Iesus: qui ut hoc esset, quibus tandem suis vel operum vel fidei praecedentibus meritis natura humana quae in illo est comparavit? Respondeatur quaeso: ille homo, ut a Verbo Patri coaeterno in unitatem personae assumptus, Filius Dei unigenitus esset, unde hoc meruit? Quod eius bonum quaecumque praecessit? Quid egit ante, quid credidit, quid petivit, ut ad hanc ineffabilem excellentiam perveniret?* (*De praed. sanct.* 15,30: BA 24, 552–554). English translation by R.J. Teske, 173.

<sup>485</sup> *De praed. sanct.* 15,30: BA 24, 552–554.



the “new man” in us, at least as far as its freely given character and its ground in infallible and immutable predestination is concerned.<sup>486</sup>

Just as God chose the man Jesus without any previous merits of his own, so did he choose those “who are called according to God’s purpose” (*vocatio secundum propositum*). This calling is certain (*certa*),<sup>487</sup> and its truth is “changeless” (*immobilis veritas praedestinationis et gratiae*). It cannot be changed by men because in predestination God not only foreknows human faith, but also causes it, or, to be more precise, had caused it before the world was created.<sup>488</sup> God chose these men according to his own will, not according to theirs, as he will bestow these wills on them in accordance with his plan.<sup>489</sup> What may be done only through the human will is caused by God as well, who works in us to will.<sup>490</sup> “For he chose us, not because we believed, but in order that we might believe ...”<sup>491</sup>

In his other work for Prosper and Hilary, *De dono perseverantiae*, in which he follows up on *De praedestinatione* in a way, Augustine did not soften his position, but only gave useful advice on how to conceal its monstrosity in preaching. He amended his argumentation only with regard to the issue of perseverance (*perseverantia*), which he had already touched on in his correspondence with Valentinus of Hadrumentum.

Not only the beginning of faith (turning towards God) and its gradual realisation in the acts of love, but also perseverance in it to the end is, in Augustine’s opinion, a gift of God.<sup>492</sup> And yet, it does not exclude the participation of the human will, which, however, is also given by God. Perseverance is a special type of gift as it cannot be lost. It is not only because God has decided in his predestination and knows what he will do (he knows

<sup>486</sup> *Nam et ipsum Dominum gloriae, in quantum homo factus est Dei Filius, praedestinatum esse didicimus. ... Sicut ergo praedestinatus est ille unus, ut caput nostrum esset, ita multi praedestinati sumus, ut membra eius essemus. ... Neque enim retributa est Christo illa generatio, sed tributa, ut alienus ab omni obligatione peccati, de Spiritu et Virgine nasceretur. Sic et nobis ut ex aqua et Spiritu renasceremur, non retributum est pro aliquo merito, sed gratis tributum (De praed. sanct. 15,31: BA 24, 556–558). The man Christ as the paradigm of predestination (*praedestinationis exemplum*) and freely given grace similarly in *De dono persev.* 24,67: BA 24, 760–762.*

<sup>487</sup> *De praed. sanct.* 16,32: BA 24, 560.

<sup>488</sup> *Electi sunt ante mundi constitutionem ea praedestinatione, in qua Deus sua futura facta praescivit (De praed. sanct. 17,34: BA 24, 568–570).*

<sup>489</sup> *De praed. sanct.* 18,36–37: BA 24, 578–580.

<sup>490</sup> ... *inclinari eorum corda ut hoc velint; ad hoc perduxisse quorum ei placuit voluntates; inclinare quorum voluerit voluntates (De praed. sanct. 20,42: BA 24, 592).*

<sup>491</sup> *Non quia credidimus, sed ut credamus elegit nos (De praed. sanct. 19,38: BA 24, 584).* English translation by R.J. Teske, 181.

<sup>492</sup> *De dono persev.* 2,2: BA 24, 602–604; *De dono persev.* 17,45–46: BA 24, 710–712.

infallibly and immutably who he will endow with perseverance),<sup>493</sup> but also because of the specific character of this very virtue: those who lost perseverance never actually had it, for otherwise they would have persevered.<sup>494</sup>

God endows some with the gift of perseverance and some not, according to his will (although he surely could avert their fall),<sup>495</sup> just as he endows some with faith and some not, even if the latter might believe had they been provided with his help:

And he does not help adults whom he does not will to help, even those he foresaw would believe because of his miracles if they were worked among them. In his predestination he decided otherwise about them in a hidden, but just way.<sup>496</sup>

Through the destiny of the condemned ones, says Augustine, God shows what men deserve and the greatness of the grace conferred on the elect.<sup>497</sup> It remains hidden how righteous God chooses men for one destiny or another;<sup>498</sup> it is clear, nevertheless, that he does not follow fate (*fatum*)—for which the Pelagians criticise Augustine’s doctrine on grace—but “the good pleasure of His will” (*secundum placitum voluntatis eius*).<sup>499</sup>

As for the preaching strategy, Augustine maintains that the theory of God’s predestination is an inseparable part of the doctrine on gratuitous grace, and as such must be made known face to face with the Pelagian danger<sup>500</sup> (although the doctrine is valid irrespective of the Pelagians, and Augustine himself arrived at it independently<sup>501</sup>). However, it must be done expertly so that it does not undermine the trust of men in the role of their own moral and ascetical efforts. It is true, says Augustine, that sinners will not arise unless they are the elect ones and aided by grace, but it is not always appropriate that they should be told so:

---

<sup>493</sup> *De dono persev.* 9,21: BA 24, 640–642; *De dono persev.* 14,35: BA 24, 680–682; *De dono persev.* 18,47: BA 24, 718.

<sup>494</sup> *De dono persev.* 1,1: BA 24, 600–602; *De dono persev.* 6,10: BA 24, 620.

<sup>495</sup> *De dono persev.* 9,22: BA 24, 642.

<sup>496</sup> ... *et maioribus etiam his quos praevidit, si apud eos facta essent, suis miraculis credituros, quibus non vult subvenire, non subvenit; de quibus in sua praedestinatione occulte quidem, sed iuste aliud iudicavit* (*De dono persev.* 11,25: BA 24, 652–654). English translation by R.J. Teske, 206.

<sup>497</sup> *De dono persev.* 8,16: BA 24, 632; *De dono persev.* 8,19: BA 24, 636.

<sup>498</sup> *De dono persev.* 8,18: BA 24, 634.

<sup>499</sup> *De dono persev.* 12,28–29: BA 24, 662–664; *De dono persev.* 12,31: BA 24, 670.

<sup>500</sup> *De dono persev.* 14,36: BA 24, 686; *De dono persev.* 16,41: BA 24, 698.

<sup>501</sup> *De dono persev.* 20,52–53: BA 24, 728–730. In particular, Augustine mentions his answer to Simplicianus (1,2) and the tag: “Grant what you command, and command what you will” from his *Confessions*; see above, chap. II.2.4.

... [O]thers who dally in the enjoyment of sins worthy of condemnation, even if they are predestined, have not yet risen up, because the help of merciful grace has not yet raised them up. For, if some are not yet called whom God has predestined by his grace to be chosen, they will receive the same grace by which they shall will to be chosen and shall be chosen. But if there are some who obey, but are not predestined for his kingdom and glory, they last only for a time and will not remain up to the end in the same obedience. Although these statements are true, one should, nonetheless, not state them in the hearing of many people ... Nor is it at all necessary to say what follows, namely, "The rest of you who dally in the enjoyment of sins have not yet risen up, because the help of merciful grace has not raised you up" ...<sup>502</sup>

On the contrary, the sinners should be encouraged to arise—but if they do, they must also learn that it is not their merit, but the fulfilment of God's plan of grace.<sup>503</sup> Not even those who listen to the voice of God should be told that "if there are any of you who obey, but are predestined to be rejected (*si praeordinati estis reiiciendi*), the power to obey will be withdrawn so that you cease to obey". It would be better to express it in the third person: "But if any obey, but are not predestined for his kingdom and glory, they last only for a time and will not remain up to the end in the same obedience."<sup>504</sup> Thus everybody should be encouraged, although what we ask for is given to us by God, and only those who were elected will obey.<sup>505</sup> By the same token, it makes sense to pray for other men, or, more precisely, for the strength of their wills given by God. Although he has already decided about their destiny, we do not know how and are to wish for the salvation of all.<sup>506</sup>

<sup>502</sup> ... caeteri vero qui in peccatorum damnabilium delectatione remorantur, si et ipsi praeordinati sunt, ideo nondum surrexerunt, quia nondum eos adiutorium gratiae miserantis erexit; si qui enim nondum sunt vocati, quos gratia sua praeordinavit eligendos, accipient eamdem gratiam, qua electi esse velint et sint; si qui autem obediunt, sed in regnum eius et gloriam praeordinati non sunt, temporales sunt, nec usque in finem in eadem obedientia permanent: quamvis ergo haec vera sint, non tamen isto modo dicenda sunt audientibus multis ... Nec illud quod sequitur, est omnino dicendum, id est: "Ceteri vero qui in peccatorum delectatione remoramini, ideo nondum surrexistis, quia necdum vos adiutorium gratiae miserantis erexit" ... (*De dono persev.* 22,58–59; BA 24, 740–742). English translation by R.J. Teske, 231.

<sup>503</sup> *De dono persev.* 22,59; BA 24, 742–744.

<sup>504</sup> "Et si qui estis qui obeditis, si praeordinati estis reiiciendi, subtrahentur obediendi vires, ut obedire cessetis". Quid enim sententiae deperit, si ita dicatur: Si qui autem obediunt, sed in regnum eius et gloriam praeordinati non sunt, temporales sunt, nec usque in finem in eadem obedientia permanent? (*De dono persev.* 22,61; BA 24, 746). English translation by R.J. Teske, 232.

<sup>505</sup> *De dono persev.* 14,35; BA 24, 684; *De dono persev.* 14,37; BA 24, 688–690.

<sup>506</sup> *De dono persev.* 23,63–65; BA 24, 750–756.

Speaking openly about God's "predestination", says Augustine, is the same as speaking about his "foreknowledge". If God foreknows whether a man will persevere or not, for some men it might cast doubt on their attempts to persevere.<sup>507</sup>

This statement is astounding (while the confusing character of the others is nothing new). Does Augustine really think that as far as the value of human effort is concerned, there is no difference whether God *foreknows* it or its failure or whether he has *decided* about it himself? Human effort does make a difference in each case: either men decide about their destinies with their own efforts (supported by God's help) and God foreknows the result (which, fortunately, men do not)—or God prepared a plan in advance which men only fulfil (with their wills, which God gives them or does not, according to his plan). Was Augustine not aware of this distinction? Or did he perhaps—in accordance with his preaching strategy—regard it as more appropriate that it should not be mentioned?

\*\*\*

In the works from the period of the Pelagian dispute which are not directly polemical there is a noticeable increase in Augustine's interest in the issue of grace and a gradual radicalisation of his idea of the helpless human will.

The question of the origin of individual souls, in which Augustine—despite his affinity with this solution—never finally settled for traducianism, mainly shows Augustine's unwavering insistence on inherited human guilt (although this strange notion is virtually incompatible with all the anthropological concepts he regards as acceptable).

In the quite exceptional small works *De videndo Deo* and *De praesentia Dei* Augustine is concerned with grace as the dwelling of God in man, without addressing the Pelagian issues; similarly, in the treatise on grace in the New Testament he focuses on the novelty of Christianity as a religion of freely given grace and love, which follows spiritual, not temporal goals, and the "enemies of grace" are mentioned only marginally. In Augustine's sermons on Rom. 7:5–8:17 the anti-Pelagian problematic is present only implicitly. Their main message seems to be the Christian struggle against concupiscence, supported by grace. The fifteen books of *De Trinitate*, with their long genesis, capture various levels of Augustine's ideas on the image of God in man, the voluntary turning of man towards God, and the gift of the Holy Spirit as consubstantial love between the Father and Son, through which men may participate in divinity and be adopted as sons of God.

<sup>507</sup> *De dono persev.* 22,57: BA 24, 740; *De dono persev.* 22,61: BA 24, 746.

On the other hand, Augustine's sermons on the Gospel of John and the Psalms, which date to the period in question, have a distinctly anti-Pelagian nature. They especially put emphasis on grace as an affective influence on the human will, as a "sweetness", which is the only thing which may compete with the unpropitious concupiscence persisting in the members of Adam's race.

Augustine's scepticism concerning human powers seems to culminate in his *Enchiridion* on faith, hope and love addressed to Laurentius, in which the free choice of the will is virtually cancelled as a punishment, and in which even the first man does not have a genuine chance to use his freedom well.

In the extensive treatise *De civitate Dei*, building on the polarity of righteous condemnation and freely given grace, Augustine rejects the pagan idea of a determining fate and insists on the importance of the human will, which is "in our power"; at the same time, however, he admits openly that the human will is influenced by grace, which divides (through the will or love) men into two groups, now entangled together: "the city of God" and "the city of the devil".

In his correspondence with the monks of Hadrumetum and Gaul Augustine reached the extreme limit of his doctrine on grace. Grace "conquered" to the extent that actually everything in human destinies—apart from the single transgression of the founder of the human race, for which all are punished—is determined by it. Before each man is born it is already established whether he is to receive freely given grace or become a pitiable demonstration of what the first man caused with his will. Men do remain willing beings and decide about their actions on their own, but their wills are determined by God: either his aid turns their wills to the good, or he deliberately leaves them to evil; he endows the hearts of men with love which works good deeds in them, or, in accordance with his plan, he allows them to sin; he endows men with an efficacious will to persevere to the very end, or he lets them fall away as a paradigm of this freely given gift. While Adam, as an erring founder of the human race, is the prototype of condemned men, Christ in his sinless humanity is the prototype of the elect. The former was given the "ability not to sin", which he rejected with his will; the latter became "unable to sin", which, because of the will that was given, was realised in him. It is the gift of the will, not of a mere ability, which is the distinctive feature of salvation in the second founder of the human race, who—like Adam—forms one body with his offspring. While being a member of Adam's race is given by the propagation of the human race, being a member of the "new" mankind is established by the will, given by God. God

himself decides who will be left in Adam's "mass of perdition", where all men belong as a result of their origin, and who will be allowed to become a member of the body of Christ through faith.



### CHAPTER THREE

#### POLEMIC AGAINST JULIAN OF ECLANUM (419–430)

The dispute with Julian of Eclanum, which occupied Augustine for the last ten years of his life, is undoubtedly the most extensive and the most passionate literary exchange of arguments Augustine had ever been engaged in. Not in the ascetical Pelagius, who left for the East rather than arguing with Augustine, or his straightforward disciple Caelestius, who was condemned quickly, but only in this bishop, a generation younger and with a classical education, who was among the elite of the Italian episcopacy (he was the son of Memorius, bishop of Capua, and the son-in-law of Bishop Aemilius of Beneventum; on the occasion of his wedding, Paulinus of Nola composed verses to celebrate the young couple<sup>1</sup>), did Augustine meet his match, not only in eloquence and tenaciousness, but also in the importance he attributed to the polemic.<sup>2</sup> Face to face with Augustine's doctrine

---

<sup>1</sup> See Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina*, 25; CSEL 30, 238–245; on Paulinus' wedding song for Julian, see S. Mratschek, *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*, Göttingen 2002, 332 f., 520 f.

<sup>2</sup> The first modern portrait of Julian was given by A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus*, TU 15/3, Leipzig 1897. As for his approach and his results, this follower of Harnack did not differ fundamentally from his teacher: Julian is presented here as an heir to the peripatetic logic and Stoic ethics, who, despite his undeniable personal integrity, misses the substance of Christianity. Nevertheless, Bruckner mitigates Harnack's conclusion concerning the Pelagian teaching as "essentially Godless (im tiefsten Grunde gottlos)" (A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III, 201), pointing out that Julian, who was willing to bear so much hardship for his conception of Christianity, must have truly believed in a righteous God (see A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum*, 176). In the 20th century some attention was paid to the newly identified exegetical works by Julian and his translations of Theodore of Mopsuestia (e.g. Julian's commentary on the minor prophets was acknowledged as a "forgotten pearl of old Christian literature"; see G. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Roma 1958, 137). An attempt to modify the image of Julian as a heretic and advocate of "radical rationalism in the Stoic vein rather than the Christian one" (as even H.-I. Marrou had it in his remark on the paradoxical occurrence of Julian in the medieval catalogue of saints by Petrus de Natalibus; see H.-I. Marrou, "La canonisation de Julien d'Eclane", in: *HJ* 77, 1958, 434) was later made by F. Refoulé, a Dominican who showed an affinity between Julian's conception of human nature and grace and the later teaching of Thomas Aquinas (according to his interpretation, both authors drew on Aristotelian philosophy connected with the Christian notion of grace raising the good nature to a new level; see F. Refoulé, "Julien d'Éclane, théologien et philosophe", in: *RechSR* 52, 1964, 42–



of grace and the anti-Pelagian campaign, which was gradually sanctified in the Western church by several Roman bishops, Julian felt the need to oppose the “Manichaeen” misinterpretation of Christianity originating from Africa<sup>3</sup> and defend the good creator, the goodness of human nature and marriage, and the voluntary effort of men to achieve virtue and holiness as something meaningful.

Augustine’s polemic against Julian includes four works: the second book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*; *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* (four books); *Contra Iulianum* (six books) and *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* (six more books).<sup>4</sup> These seventeen books in total (the last treatise is the only work by Augustine not to be finished), which take up more than nine hundred columns in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina* (volumes 44 and 45), are both disconcerting and tiring to read. The positions of both sides are given in advance, the arguments have more or less been presented already, and their constant repetition does not quite reveal any new depths even if one regards them as two spirals of parallel monologues. It is actually a “conversation of the deaf”,<sup>5</sup> i.e., a double soliloquy, cyclical and, on top of that, concerned with a curious topic, to put it mildly, albeit one determined by Augustine’s theology.

### 3.1. “I” and Concupiscence (De nuptiis et concupiscentia)

The point of departure of Augustine’s polemic against Julian of Eclanum was a request for an explanation of the Pelagian issue from the *comes* Valerius of Ravenna, to whom Julian turned in the tense atmosphere of the year 418 in order to ask for his support in the Pelagian matter at the imperial court.

---

84 and 233–247). A more sympathetic theological presentation of Julian’s faith in a good creator, which excludes the notion of hereditary guilt, was given by M. Lamberigts, “Julian of Aeclanum: a Plea for a Good Creator”, in: *Augustiniana*, 38, 1988, 5–24 (and other articles by the same author, see Bibliography). However, a genuine re-evaluation of Julian’s image is only applied in the extensive synthetic monograph by J. Lössl from 2001, in which Julian, a distinguished scholar of a similar calibre to Augustine, is presented as an heir to the late ancient philosophy and Antiochian exegesis, who was condemned not for his works, but for his protest against the anathematisation of the Pelagians, which he regarded as premature, and who went on to become a victim of the anti-Nestorian intrigue of Cyril of Alexandria at the Council of Ephesus (see J. Lössl, *Julian von Aeclanum*). For an overview of modern research, see also M. Lamberigts, “Pelagius and Pelagians”, 267–272.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,17,31; *NBA* 18/1, 614.

<sup>4</sup> The progress of the dispute is discussed by Augustine in *Contra Iul. imp., praef.: CSEL* 85/1, 3f.; see also *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,3; *CSEL* 85/2, 5; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,5; *CSEL* 85/2, 10.

<sup>5</sup> See A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches*, 126.

Augustine's reply, i.e., the first book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (from 419), faces the Pelagian objection that the doctrine on original sin (or, more precisely, on libidinous procreation as the point of its transmission) actually leads to a rejection of matrimony.

Well aware that such a doctrine would put him beyond the limits of Christian orthodoxy, Augustine tries to explain the difference between “the good of marriage” as a divine gift and the evil of shame-producing concupiscence (*pudenda concupiscentia*) as a consequence of sin, which is not an inherent part of marriage, but merely its secondary corruption.<sup>6</sup>

This idea is mainly supported by two biblical passages: the account of shame, which was not originally part of human nature, but appeared as a consequence of guilt (Gen. 2:25; 3:7),<sup>7</sup> and the apostle's lament for the “mortal body” in which the “law in my members”, i.e., the “sin that dwells in me”, opposes the human mind (Rom. 7:14–24) and enslaves men against their will.<sup>8</sup> Augustine's interpretation, however, does not follow from these passages: in his opinion, as we already know from his early works, the disobedience of man against the creator is punished by the disobedience of other creatures against man. The disorder of the original balance of creation, says Augustine, also involves the disobedience of the body, manifested to the greatest extent in the libidinous motion of the genitals, which is beyond the control of the will and as such becomes an object of shame. For that reason, the first men made a girdle of concealment (*succinctoria*)<sup>9</sup> from fig-leaves after their transgression in order to cover their *pudenda*, even though their transgression was not concerned with sexuality.<sup>10</sup> On the contrary, the act of carnal procreation of the first men was, according to Augustine, part of God's intention;<sup>11</sup> however, it acquired as an “added” value a libidinous character which, unfortunately, became an inseparable part of it in this “mortal body”. Marriage, established by God as an institution aimed at the procreation of the human race, may use this evil to a good end, but the children born from wedlock are “under the devil's power”, and it is from the devil that sin and, consequently, concupiscence come.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *De nupt.* I,1,1: BA 23, 54.

<sup>7</sup> *De nupt.* I,6,7: BA 23, 68–70.

<sup>8</sup> *De nupt.* I,27,30: BA 23, 120–122.

<sup>9</sup> *De nupt.* II,7,17: BA 23, 182.

<sup>10</sup> *De nupt.* I,6,7: BA 23, 68–70; *De nupt.* I,22,24: BA 23, 108.

<sup>11</sup> *De nupt.* I,20,22: BA 23, 106; *De nupt.* I,23,26: BA 23, 112.

<sup>12</sup> *De nupt.* I,20,22: BA 23, 106; *De nupt.* I,23,26: BA 23, 112. As E.A. Clark tries to show, Augustine's emphasis on marriage as a physical relationship results first from his polemic

The libidinous character of procreation results from concupiscence, i.e., from the consequences of sin which remain in the mortal body even after baptism, as we already know.<sup>13</sup> Procreation in its libidinous form is even a direct consequence of concupiscence, which is why one transmits the other; and, what is more—this unintuitive statement has also been mentioned before—it transmits not only concupiscence as a punishment for sin, but the very guilt of sin as well.<sup>14</sup>

As long, then, as the child does not receive this forgiveness of sins, this law of sin is present in it in such a way that it is also counted as sin. That is, its guilt is also present with it so that it makes the child deserve eternal punishment. The parents, after all, pass on to the child of their flesh what the parents themselves are as a result of their birth in the flesh (*carnaliter natus*), not what they are as a result of their spiritual rebirth (*spiritualiter renatus*). ... [I]f God's grace transforms someone ..., the defect of the original nature (*vitium primae nativitatis*), that is, original sin transmitted and contracted from carnal concupiscence, is in that person forgiven, covered over, and not held against one.<sup>15</sup>

That is why infants must be baptised in order that the “spiritual birth” might rectify the dubious character of their “carnal” birth coming from the “vitiated” nature (*vitiata*) or even from nature in the crucial point of its corruption, i.e., from the point where the “law in my members” moves beyond the control of the will:

---

against the Manichaeans and later with Julian (see E.A. Clark, “Adam’s Only Companion”). However, the author rather leaves aside Augustine’s bizarre argument concerning the guilt transmitted by procreation, against which Julian felt the need to protest.

<sup>13</sup> *Si autem quaeritur, quomodo ista concupiscentia carnis maneat in regenerato, in quo universorum facta est remissio peccatorum, quandoquidem per ipsam seminatur et cum ipsa carnalis gignitur proles parentis etiam baptizati, aut certe, si in parente baptizato potest esse et peccatum non esse, cur eadem ipsa in prole peccatum sit: ad haec respondetur dimitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut in peccatum non imputetur* (*De nupt.* I,25,28: BA 23, 116–118).

<sup>14</sup> *... haec, inquam, concupiscentia, quae solo sacramento regenerationis expiatur, profecto peccati vinculum regeneratione traicit in posteros, nisi ab illo et ipsi regeneratione solvantur* (*De nupt.* I,23,25: BA 23, 112).

<sup>15</sup> *Haec itaque remissio peccatorum quamdiu non fit in prole, sic ibi est lex ista peccati, ut etiam in peccatum imputetur. Id est, ut etiam reatus eius cum illa sit, quae teneat aeterni supplicii debitorem. Hoc enim traicit parens in prolem carnalem, quod est ipse carnaliter natus, non quod spiritualiter est renatus ... si quid inde ... gratia divina convertit, ibi vitium primae nativitatis, quod erat originale peccatum de carnali concupiscentia traductum et adtractum, remittatur, tegatur, non imputetur ...* (*De nupt.* I,32,37: BA 23, 134–136). English translation by R.J. Teske, 50 f.

Human nature is condemned, not on its own account, for it is praiseworthy, since it is God's work, but on account of the defect by which it is ruined (*vitiata*) and which merits condemnation. ... For this reason the devil holds the little ones guilty (*reos tenet*), for they are not born of the good that makes marriage good, but from the evil of concupiscence of which marriage makes good use, but at which marriage still blushes. ... [W]hen they come to the act of procreation, that licit and honorable intercourse cannot take place free from the heat of sexual desire (*sine ardore libidinis*) ... Whether it follows upon or precedes the will, it is only that desire which arouses, as if by its own command, the members which cannot be aroused by the will (*moveri voluntate non possunt*). In that way it shows that it is not the servant of a will that is in command, but the punishment of a will (*supplicium voluntatis*) that is disobedient; it shows that it is a servant which has to be moved, not by free choice, but by some seductive stimulus (*illecebrosus aliquo stimulo*) and is, therefore, something to be ashamed of. This concupiscence of the flesh is no longer counted as a sin in those who have been reborn, but it comes to our nature only from sin. This concupiscence of the flesh is like a child of sin and also like a mother of many sins ... Any child that is born from this concupiscence of the flesh is bound by original sin ...<sup>16</sup>

This bizarre argumentation makes it possible for Augustine to analyse the split of the will in quite a remarkable way. Concupiscence as the “sin that dwells in me” (Rom. 7:17.20) is, in Augustine's opinion, a secret force (*vis occulta*<sup>17</sup>) which is awakened so that it could oppose the will. This force, already located by the apostle Paul as being in the “body” is not “I” unless I give my consent to it with my will. Although such consent is in fact self-denial of the will (*oderit quia consentit*), it is still an act of the will; it is I that do it and thus identify with the “sin that dwells in me”. “It is I” (*ipse*) who is therefore the “sin” as well, i.e., the force slumbering in my “body”. An originally heterogeneous latent force is thus embraced by my identity:

<sup>16</sup> *Non enim propter se ipsam, quae laudabilis est, quia opus Dei est, sed propter damnabile vitium, quo vitiata est, natura humana damnatur. ... Quapropter natos non ex bono, quo bonae sunt nuptiae, sed ex malo concupiscentiae, quo bene quidem utuntur nuptiae, de quo tamen erubescunt et nuptiae, reos diabolus parvulos tenet ... cum ventum fuerit ad opus generandi, ipse ille licitus honestusque concubitus non potest esse sine ardore libidinis ... Qui certe ardor, sive sequatur sive praevenerit voluntatem, non tamen nisi ipse quodam quasi suo imperio movet membra, quae moveri voluntate non possunt, atque ita se indicat non imperantis famulum, sed inoboedientis supplicium voluntatis nec libero arbitrio, sed inlecebrosus aliquo stimulo commovendum et ideo pudendum. Ex hac carnis concupiscentia, quae licet in regeneratis iam non deputetur in peccatum, tamen naturae non accidit nisi de peccato, ex hac, inquam, concupiscentia carnis tamquam filia peccati et ..., etiam peccatorum matre multorum, quaecumque nascitur proles, originali est obligata peccato ...* (*De nupt.* I,23,26–24,27: BA 23, 112–116). English translation by R.J. Teske, 45f.

<sup>17</sup> *De nupt.* I,33,38: BA 23, 136.

That person is, however, very much mistaken who, while consenting to the concupiscence of the flesh and definitely deciding to do what it desires, still supposes that it is all right to say, *It is not I who do it*. After all, a person consents, even if one hates the fact. For these two can coexist in one person: both the hating it because one knows it is evil and the doing it because one decided to do it. ... If some say, *It is not I who do it, but the sin that dwells in me* (Rom. 7:20), because, when they decide and do it, they are displeased with themselves, they are so mistaken that they do not even recognize themselves. For though a person is that whole composite, namely, the heart that decides and the body that carries it out, these people still do not think that it is they themselves who do it.<sup>18</sup>

And yet, men need not give their consent to the “sin that dwells in me”, i.e., concupiscence. In such a case, they detach themselves from this force (for the time being) without being able to remove or eliminate it; it then becomes (for the time being) something external, or, in other words, its expansion into one’s own identity does not continue.<sup>19</sup> When the apostle says that the will is present with him but not the power to “bring to completion” (*perficere*) the good thing, he means, according to Augustine, that in this life it is impossible to “bring to completion” (*perficere*) a good thing, i.e., to eradicate concupiscence entirely.<sup>20</sup> That will only be possible in the resurrected body, not in the “body of death” (Rom. 7:24) we have now.<sup>21</sup>

In their present mortal bodies men are still burdened with the disease of concupiscence, which afflicts not only their “body”, but themselves as well: concupiscence brings me into captivity (*captivans me*; Rom. 7:23),<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> *Multum autem fallitur homo qui, consentiens concupiscentiae carnis suae et quod illa desiderat decernens facere et statuens, putat sibi adhuc esse dicendum: Non ego operor illud, etiamsi oderit quia consentit. Simul enim est utrumque: et ipse odit, quia malum esse novit, et ipse facit, quia facere statuit. ... Non ego operor illud, sed quod habitat in me peccatum, quia cum id decernit et facit displicet sibi, tantum errat, ut nec se ipsum agnoscat, quando, cum ex toto ipse sit et corde statuyente et corpore implente, adhuc se ipsum esse non putat* (*De nupt.* I,28,31: BA 23, 124). English translation by R.J. Teske, 47 f.

<sup>19</sup> *Qui ergo dicit: Iam non ego operor illud, sed quod habitat in me peccatum, si tantummodo concupiscit, verum dicit, non si cordis consensione decernit aut etiam corporis ministerio perficit* (*De nupt.* I,29,31: BA 23, 124).

<sup>20</sup> *... tunc perficitur bonum, quando desideria mala nulla sunt, sicut tunc perficitur malum, quando malis desideriis oboeditur. Quando autem sunt quidem, sed non eis oboeditur, nec malum perficitur, quia non eis oboeditur, nec bonum, quia sunt, sed fit ex aliqua parte bonum, quia concupiscentiae malae non consentitur, et ex aliqua parte remanet malum, quia vel concupiscitur* (*De nupt.* I,29,32: BA 23, 124–126).

<sup>21</sup> *De nupt.* I,31,35: BA 23, 130–132. On the change in Augustine’s interpretation of the lines in Rom. 7:22–25a (no longer a lament of a man “under the law”, but the apostle himself, i.e., a man “under grace”), see above, chap. I.3.3b, n. 95; chap. III.2.4.

<sup>22</sup> *De nupt.* I,30,34: BA 23, 128–130.

probably because too much of its latent force has intruded into my identity. For Augustine “I” seems to be “my will”, or what my will—in its split—has let into my identity.

If men find “delight in the law of God” with their mind (Rom. 7:22), it is solely a gift of grace. Only grace can make the delight overcome the power of concupiscence in order that men might find “delight” in what corresponds to their will, i.e., their will becomes stronger than concupiscence. That, says Augustine, is the liberation of the will brought about by grace: “There we are truly free where we not unwillingly take delight.” (*Ibi sumus veraciter liberi, ubi non delectamur inviti.*)<sup>23</sup>

Although the second book of *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* has the same addressee, it is already an open polemic against the four books of *Ad Turbantium* from the summer of 419, Julian’s reply to Augustine’s first book, the extracts (*chartulae*) from which had been sent to Augustine by Valerius.<sup>24</sup> As for the subject matter, Augustine does not add much new to his previous reflections, but the reader learns for the first time about the purport of Julian’s objections.

Above all, Julian seems to have hit a sensitive spot in seeing the influence of Manichaeism on Augustine’s theology of sin and vitiated nature which is to be overcome by grace. According to Augustine, says Julian, one can only avoid Pelagianism if he becomes a Manichaean.<sup>25</sup> For it is a Manichaean fallacy to presume that children are born from the power of the devil and not from the power of God the creator or that men lack the freedom of will to choose a virtuous life.<sup>26</sup> To ascribe the fruits of marriage to the devil means rejecting matrimony itself and, consequently, human nature and its creator.<sup>27</sup> The human body was—together with its sexuality—created by

<sup>23</sup> *De nupt.* I,30,33; *BA* 23, 128.

<sup>24</sup> *De nupt.* II,1,1: *BA* 23, 146.

<sup>25</sup> *De nupt.* II,3,7: *BA* 23, 158. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 1: *CCL* 88, 340f. On the affinity between Augustine’s anti-Pelagian position and Manichaeism, see K. Rudolph, “Augustinus Manichaicus”; M. Lamberigts, “Was Augustine a Manichaean? The Assessment of Julian of Aclanum”, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism*, 113–136. However, as G.R. Evans points out, the expressions “Manichee” and “Pelagian” are used in this polemic in a derivative sense: they are to expose the hidden, unadmitted implication of the opponent’s thinking (see G.R. Evans, “Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee”, in: *VCh* 35, 1981, 232–246).

<sup>26</sup> *De nupt.* II,3,8: *BA* 23, 160. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 14–15: *CCL* 88, 342–344; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 22: *CCL* 88, 345f.; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 108: *CCL* 88, 365; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 113: *CCL* 88, 366; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 124: *CCL* 88, 367.

<sup>27</sup> *De nupt.* II,4,11: *BA* 23, 168. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 20: *CCL* 88, 345; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 74: *CCL* 88, 358f.; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 135: *CCL* 88, 368.

God, and fertility is a gift of God as well—so why should its fruits belong to the devil?<sup>28</sup> Instead of “concupiscence of flesh”, Julian prefers to speak of “natural appetite” (*adpetitus naturalis*), which in itself has no negative connotations for him,<sup>29</sup> although it may exceed the limits of moderation and become guilt.<sup>30</sup> The goodness of marriage, says Julian, cannot be advocated if its fruits are afflicted with hereditary sin.<sup>31</sup> That is why he rejects the notion of original sin: after all, sin is a voluntary act (*nec sine voluntate delictum*).<sup>32</sup> How could a newborn infant, who has no will of his own, be sinful? Matrimony is good and it is no source of sin, and the parents have committed no crime if their child was born from legitimate marriage.<sup>33</sup> Sin is thus not transmitted by procreation in the human race, but by imitation (*imitatione*), and Paul’s line in Rom. 5:12 is to be interpreted accordingly: “By one man sin entered into the world” (*per unum hominem peccatum in hunc mundum intravit*).<sup>34</sup> When Augustine maintains that sin does not come out of the will, but out of nature, it is obviously a Manichaean notion of original evil in nature (*originale malum*).<sup>35</sup>

Against these objections Augustine defends himself by arguments concerning the good of marriage, evil concupiscence<sup>36</sup> and original sin,<sup>37</sup> which had already appeared in the first book. His main argument in favour of the evil nature of concupiscence, or the libido, is its shrouding in shame: Why should men be ashamed of the good works of God if these were not

<sup>28</sup> *De nupt.* II,4,12–13: BA 23, 170–172. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 21–29: CCL 88, 345–348.

<sup>29</sup> *De nupt.* II,7,17: BA 23, 182 (see also *De nupt.* II,10,23: BA 23, 194–196). See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 33–41: CCL 88, 349 f.; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 62: CCL 88, 355 f.

<sup>30</sup> *De nupt.* II,19,34: BA 23, 220–222. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 44–45: CCL 88, 351; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 48: CCL 88, 351; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 94: CCL 88, 363; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 130: CCL 88, 368; *Ad Turb.* II, frag. 146: CCL 88, 371.

<sup>31</sup> *De nupt.* II,26,41: BA 23, 234.

<sup>32</sup> *De nupt.* II,5,15: BA 23, 174–176. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 18: CCL 88, 345.

<sup>33</sup> *De nupt.* II,27,44: BA 23, 242. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 31–32: CCL 88, 348 f.; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 64: CCL 88, 356 f.; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 68: CCL 88, 357; *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 75: CCL 88, 359 f.

<sup>34</sup> ... *adserentes hoc ideo dictum esse, quod Adam peccaverit primum, in quo de cetero quisquis peccare voluit, peccandi invenit exemplum, ut peccatum scilicet non generatione ab illo uno in omnes homines, sed illius unius imitatione transiret* (*De nupt.* II,27,45: BA 23, 244). See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* IV, frag. 324a: CCL 88, 395. On Julian’s interpretation of this line, see also below, chap. III.3.4. On Augustine’s different interpretation, see above, chap. III.1.1 incl. n. 38.

<sup>35</sup> *De nupt.* II,29,49: BA 23, 256. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* I, frag. 78: CCL 88, 360.

<sup>36</sup> *De nupt.* II,26,42: BA 23, 236–238; *De nupt.* II,5,14: BA 23, 172.

<sup>37</sup> *De nupt.* II,5,15: BA 23, 176; *De nupt.* II,27,46: BA 23, 248.

corrupted by the devilish admixture, i.e., were not disobedient to the will? Why is it that Julian himself is ashamed to speak of it and resorts to coy paraphrases without ever mentioning the libido, i.e., concupiscence?<sup>38</sup>

He is silent, because he feels ashamed, and yet with the amazing impudence of shame (*pudoris inpuidentia*)—if one can say this—he is not ashamed to praise what he is ashamed to mention.<sup>39</sup>

It is the libidinous character of procreation which afflicts the fruits of marriage with lethal evil, although the fruits in themselves are good. Irrespective of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the relationship of the parents, the offspring are works of God, though afflicted with the transmitted guilt which requires a new birth.<sup>40</sup> It is not as men, but as sinners, burdened with the guilt of their forefather, that they are “under the devil’s dominion”.<sup>41</sup> The notion of sin transmitted in the human race is not a Manichaean construction, as Julian suggests, but one held by the Catholic faith from ancient times (*catholica fides credit antiquitus*),<sup>42</sup> attested to by Ambrose and Cyprian.<sup>43</sup>

At the same time, Augustine tries to explain how his position differs from the Manichaean one: he does not teach that a human being has two natures from the beginning, one good and the other evil, intermingled by an evil creator, but that the good nature created by the good creator was corrupted (*vitiata*) by the human will.<sup>44</sup> This corruption, however, is not another nature, but only a disorder (*vitium*) or weakness (*languor*) of the original nature, which became sinful (*peccatrix*)<sup>45</sup> and may be healed only through grace.

<sup>38</sup> *De nupt.* II,6,16–7,18: BA 23, 180–182; *De nupt.* II,9,22: BA 23, 192–194; *De nupt.* II,12,25: BA 23, 200.

<sup>39</sup> *Tacet, quia pudet, et mira—si dici potest—pudoris inpuidentia, quod nominare pudet, laudare non pudet* (*De nupt.* II,7,17: BA 23, 182). English translation by R.J. Teske, 63.

<sup>40</sup> *De nupt.* II,20,35: BA 23, 224; *De nupt.* II,21,36: BA 23, 226; *De nupt.* II,33,55: BA 23, 272–274.

<sup>41</sup> *De nupt.* II,4,11: BA 23, 168.

<sup>42</sup> *De nupt.* II,12,25: BA 23, 200.

<sup>43</sup> *De nupt.* II,5,15: BA 23, 176–178; *De nupt.* II,29,51: BA 23, 262–264. Augustine is referring to Ambrose’s exposition of Isaiah, preserved today only in his quotations, in which Christ’s sinlessness is distinctly related to his birth from a virgin (see *Fr. Es.* 1: CCL 14, 405; already quoted in *De nupt.* I,35,40: BA 23, 142) and to Cyprian’s letter to Fidus, where “the sins of another” are mentioned (*aliena peccata*) together with “the contagion of the ancient death” (*contagium mortis antiquae*), which allegedly burdens newborn infants (*Ep.* 64,5,2: CCL 3C, 424f.).

<sup>44</sup> *De nupt.* II,3,9: BA 23, 162.

<sup>45</sup> *Unde illo magno primi hominis peccato natura ibi nostra in deterius commutata non solum est facta peccatrix, verum etiam genuit peccatores. Et tamen ipse languor, quo bene vivendi virtus periit, non est utique natura, sed vitium ...* (*De nupt.* II,34,57: BA 23, 280).



Denying the existence of evil transmitted in the human race and healed through grace, the Pelagians represent the other extreme with respect to the Manichaeans, though no less baneful: while the Manichaeans regard human nature, together with matrimony and its fruits, as naturally evil, the Pelagians maintain that men do not need a physician, i.e., that infants do not need to be baptised in order to be remitted of inherited guilt.<sup>46</sup> If they wish “to praise concupiscence,” Augustine concludes, they should at least “permit children to come to Christ for salvation” (cf. Mark 10:14 parr.).<sup>47</sup>

Augustine sets out the main purport of the polemic as a whole as early as in the first part of his dispute with Julian: it would not be concerned with the will and its freedom in the first place or with grace, for that matter, but mainly with the good or evil character of human nature with a view to the issue of the goodness or evil of human sexuality.

Augustine’s notion of libidinous procreation as the point of transmission of concupiscence and human guilt was already present in his earlier works. Its orthodox core seems to consist in the ancient Christian tradition concerning Christ, born from a virgin, as the only sinless man. This was not devised by Augustine; he only elaborated on it in greater detail and amended it with his notion of transmitted human guilt, which was needed as a correlate of his doctrine on grace. To what extent his strange focus on concupiscence was influenced by Augustine’s personal experience or perhaps a kind of pathological fixation on sexual issues is, fortunately, not the issue here. From the historical point of view, both sides seem to have a share in the truth: before Augustine, the idea of inherited sin was attested to not only by the African saint Cyprian, but partially also by Augustine’s Italian teacher Ambrose of Milan, and similarly also by Ambrosiaster, Hilary, and to some extent also John Chrysostom. On the other hand, it is probably a teaching of Encratic origin, which had already been argued against by Clement of Alexandria<sup>48</sup> and watched warily by Greek theologians. It was introduced into the West by Tertullian and met with a favourable reception in the Manichaean milieu.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *De nupt.* II,3,9: BA 23, 162; *De nupt.* II,23,28: BA 23, 230–232.

<sup>47</sup> ... *sentiat de ista libidine iste quod libet, praedicet ut libet, laudet quantum libet ... tantum parvulis ... ad salvatorem Christum venire permittat* (*De nupt.* II,35,60: BA 23, 286–288).

<sup>48</sup> See *Strom.* III,100,5; GCS, Clemens II, 242.

<sup>49</sup> The development of this notion is traced in a monograph by P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux: on the Encratic origin of the teaching*, see 222–242; on Tertullian, see 260–278; on Manichaeism, see 254–256; on Ambrosiaster, Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary and John Chrysostom, see 159–202 (on Cyprian and Ambrose, see also O. Wermelinger, *Rom*, 272 ff.).

As far as the issue of grace is concerned, the first round of the polemic against Julian brings hardly anything that is new; what is of interest is Augustine's reflection on the split of the will, in which Paul's conflict between the "mind" of man and the "law of the sin" in his "members" (Rom. 7) is presented as a conflict between one's own identity ("I") and concupiscence as a seemingly heterogeneous force expanding into the identity itself because of the conscious consent of the will. The identity ("I") thus seems to be identical with the will and its sediments, i.e., I am to what I have given my voluntary consent, albeit against my will.

Against the backdrop of this conflict, the liberation of the will through grace appears to be a delight in one's own will that has been granted, a delight which turns out to be stronger than concupiscence. It is still true that a human being acts freely only when acting with delight (*liber facit, qui libens facit*), but we also learn that freedom consists in not finding delight in what contradicts one's own will (*ibi sumus veraciter liberi, ubi non delectamur inviti*). Acting freely thus means acting in accordance with one's own actual will; however, it can only be carried out through affective "delight" given by grace. In Augustine's opinion, man is a being who can best be guided by arousing the affect of delight in him.

### 3.2. *Between Manichaeism and Pelagianism* (Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum)

Face to face with the African "folk ignorance" and Augustine's "Manichaeism", Julian of Eclanum, the "spokesman of aristocratic and humanistic Greek orthodoxy",<sup>50</sup> turned to Rome, probably to the new pope, Boniface, in order to present his view of the Pelagian dispute.<sup>51</sup> In the same matter eighteen Pelagian bishops sent a letter to Thessalonica,<sup>52</sup> expecting support for their viewpoint from the Eastern church. Augustine reacted to both documents in the four books of *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* (from between 420 and 421), addressed to Pope Boniface. On one hand, he defends himself against Julian's charge of Manichaeism; on the other, he presents his doctrine on grace, which he also employs as an

<sup>50</sup> See P.F. Beatrice, *Tradux*, 256.

<sup>51</sup> See *Epistula quam ad Romanos misisse dicebatur Iulianus*, CCL 88, 396–398.

<sup>52</sup> See *Epistula Iuliano communis cum pluribus Pelagianis episcopis ad Rufum Thessalonicensem*, CCL 88, 336–340.

anti-Pelagian attack, attempting to explain why the Pelagians are “enemies of God’s grace”.<sup>53</sup>

The individual aspects of Augustine’s doctrine had already appeared in his previous works. As a result of their sin, men lost the freedom (*libertas*) to attain righteousness and eternal life, and need the grace of God in order that their weakened nature might become free. The free choice of the will (*liberum arbitrium*) remains in men, but they are only free to sin, and “sin with delight” (*cum delectatione peccant, amor peccati*). Men, who are merely “free from righteousness” (*liberi iustitiae*; cf. Rom. 6:20) for the time being, need grace to become “free from sin” (*liberi*, i.e., *liberati a peccato*).<sup>54</sup>

This is not bestowed by God according to the merits of the free choice of the will (as it cannot have any merits at all), but quite freely (*gratis*), in giving faith to men.<sup>55</sup> Nor is faith a human merit preceding grace;<sup>56</sup> on the contrary, God “draws” men (*trahere*; cf. John 6:44), i.e., endows them with the will, for he would not “draw” somebody who is already willing to come, says Augustine. Men do not believe against their will (*nolens*), but the will is given to them by God.<sup>57</sup>

Men could not be set free by the law alone even if—out of fear—they fulfilled it. The law, according to Augustine, does not inspire men with genuine love of righteousness, but only prevents them from transgressing against it under the threat of punishment. Only grace, which pours out love into the hearts of men, may bestow “delight in righteousness” (*dilectio et*

<sup>53</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,1,1–3: CSEL 60, 423f. On this treatise and its place in the crisis, see O. Wermelinger, *Décision du concile africain de 418 sur la grâce et la liberté, présentée par Augustin à Boniface, évêque de Rome*, in: P.-Y. Fux—J.-M. Roessli—O. Wermelinger (eds.), *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Acts du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1–7 avril 2001, Fribourg Suisse 2003*, 219–226.

<sup>54</sup> *Quis autem nostrum dicat, quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de genere humano? Libertas quidem periit per peccatum, sed illa, quae in paradiso fuit, habendi plenam cum immortalitate iustitiam. Propter quod natura humana divina indiget gratia ... Nam liberum arbitrium usque adeo in peccatore non periit, ut per ipsum peccent maxime omnes, qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati et hoc eis placet quod eos libet. ... Ecce ostenduntur etiam peccato minime potuisse nisi alia libertate servire. Liberi ergo a iustitia non sunt nisi arbitrio voluntatis; liberi autem a peccato non fiunt nisi gratia salvatoris* (*Contra ep. Pel.* I,2,5: CSEL 60, 425f.).

<sup>55</sup> *Nemo igitur potest habere voluntatem iustam, nisi nullis praecedentibus meritis acceperit veram, hoc est gratuitam desuper gratiam* (*Contra ep. Pel.* I,3,7: CSEL 60, 429).

<sup>56</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,3,6–7: CSEL 60, 428f.

<sup>57</sup> *Non enim ait: “duxerit”, ut illic aliquo modo intellegamus praecedere voluntatem. Quis trahitur, si iam volebat? Et tamen nemo venit, nisi velit. Trahitur ergo miris modis, ut velit, ab illo, qui novit intus in ipsis hominum cordibus operari, non ut homines, quod fieri non potest, nolentes credant, sed ut volentes ex nolentibus fiant* (*Contra ep. Pel.* I,19,37: CSEL 60, 454).

*delectatio*, or *amor iustitiae, cupiditas boni*) on men so that they do not wish to do evil even if it were not punished. Grace causes sweetness (*dulcedo*) in men, as a result of which they find delight in righteousness; it is not merely prescribed to them.<sup>58</sup>

For the good begins to be desired (*concupisci*) when it begins to become sweet. But when we do the good out of fear of punishment, not out of love of righteousness (*amore iustitiae*), we do not yet do the good in a good way, and we do not do in the heart what we seem to do in the action when we would prefer not to do it, if we could go unpunished. And so, the blessing of sweetness is the grace of God (*benedictio dulcedinis est gratia Dei*) by which he brings it about in us that we find delight in and we desire, that is, that we love (*ut nos delectet et cupiamus, hoc est amemus*), what he commands us. If God does not go before us with his grace, we not only do not complete, but we do not even begin to do what he commands.<sup>59</sup>

This attitude is typical of the free sons of God, free from slavish fear, who worship God for the sake of God himself (*propter ipsum Deum*), i.e., for the sake of eternal, not earthly things.<sup>60</sup>

However, not even grace, which makes it possible to fulfil the law with love, enables men to attain righteousness immediately in this life: “the impulse of concupiscence” (*motus concupiscendi*) remains in the “corruptible flesh”, although the will may not consent to it because of the gift of grace. “It is no more I who do it” (Rom. 7:17.20) in this impulse, i.e., I do not give my consent to my members to set forth to sin, even though they are “taken captive” by sin (*quae liberavit delectationem voluntatis a consensione cupiditatis*).<sup>61</sup>

Still, our own nature remains in the body, not an alien one (*in ipsa carne non est aliena natura, sed nostra*), says Augustine,<sup>62</sup> although it is corrupted or weak. Not to give one’s consent to its disease, i.e., concupiscence, means

<sup>58</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,9,15: CSEL 60, 436; *Contra ep. Pel.* II,9,21: CSEL 60, 483.

<sup>59</sup> *Tunc enim bonum concupisci incipit, quando dulcescere coeperit; quando autem timore poenae, non amore iustitiae fit bonum, nondum bene fit bonum nec fit in corde, quod fieri videtur in opere, quando mallet homo non facere, si posset in punire. Ergo benedictio dulcedinis est gratia Dei, qua fit in nobis, ut nos delectet et cupiamus, hoc est amemus, quod praecipit nobis. In qua si nos non praevenit Deus, non solum non perficitur, sed nec inchoatur ex nobis* (*Contra ep. Pel.* II,9,21: CSEL 60, 483). English translation by R.J. Teske, 157.

<sup>60</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* III,4,13: CSEL 60, 501.

<sup>61</sup> *Magis enim se dicit legi consentire quam carnis concupiscentiae—hanc enim peccati nomine appellat—; facere ergo se dixit et operari non affectu consentiendi et implendi, sed ipso motu concupiscendi. ... iam nunc sub gratia, quae liberavit delectationem voluntatis a consensione cupiditatis* (*Contra ep. Pel.* I,10,18: CSEL 60, 440).

<sup>62</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,10,20: CSEL 60, 442.

allowing oneself to be cured or set free by grace, which endows the will with a “delight” (*condelectatio*) in the law of God (Rom. 7:22).<sup>63</sup>

Nevertheless, men will be set free completely in the life to come: not in the “body of this death”, but in the “spiritual” one, free from concupiscence.<sup>64</sup> The conflict between the “mind” and the “law in my members” as described by the apostle in Romans 7 thus relates to a man already endowed with grace, but not with eschatological salvation. It is not a description of a man under the law, as the Pelagians maintain (and as Augustine himself previously had): the apostle is not speaking on behalf of someone else.<sup>65</sup>

Men, who on their own are only capable of sin, because their freedom of choice is taken captive by sin (*captivum*),<sup>66</sup> are thus endowed by God’s grace with a will to do good, which, however, does not cancel the voluntary character of human actions.<sup>67</sup> God helps men to fulfil what he also prescribes as their duty. Therefore, God and men cooperate in the good act, although men do so through the gift of the will, of which they are mere executors.<sup>68</sup>

It remains unfathomable to men why God endows one with the will and not another.<sup>69</sup> Grace is not given according to the acts of men, but this does not mean that it is a kind of “favouritism” (“partiality”, cf. Col. 3:25) or a “fate” (*fatum*), as the Pelagians claim<sup>70</sup>—unless the word “fate” renders the almighty will of God, not the influence of the stars and their constellations on the events of the world and the human will itself.<sup>71</sup>

Accusing Augustine of Manichaeism, the Pelagians are no less mistaken and worthy of reprobation than the Manichaeans, although both groups are opposed to one another (*inter se contrarii*).<sup>72</sup> While the Manichaeans

<sup>63</sup> ... ipsa delectatio boni, qua etiam non consentit ad malum non timore poenae, sed amore iustitiae—hoc est enim condelectari—non nisi gratiae deputanda sit (*Contra ep. Pel.* I,10,22: CSEL 60, 443).

<sup>64</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,10,17: CSEL 60, 439; *Contra ep. Pel.* I,11,23–24: CSEL 60, 443 f.

<sup>65</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,8,13: CSEL 60, 433. On the change in Augustine’s exposition of Romans 7 see above, chap. I.3.3b incl. n. 95; chap. III.3.1. On Pelagius’ exposition of the same passage, see above, chap. III.2.8, n. 347. On Julian’s exposition, see Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* frag. 316: CCL 88, 394.

<sup>66</sup> ... liberum arbitrium captivum non nisi ad peccatum valet, ad iustitiam vero nisi divinitus liberatum adiutumque non valet (*Contra ep. Pel.* III,8,24: CSEL 60, 516). See also *Contra ep. Pel.* II,5,9: CSEL 60, 468 f.

<sup>67</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,20,38: CSEL 60, 455 f.

<sup>68</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* II,9,20–21: CSEL 60, 481 f.

<sup>69</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* I,20,38: CSEL 60, 456.

<sup>70</sup> See Julian of Eclanum et alii, *Ep. ad Rufum Thessal.* frag. 4: CCL 88, 337.

<sup>71</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* II,5,9–6,12: CSEL 60, 469–472.

<sup>72</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* II,2,4: CSEL 60, 463.

deny that God is the good creator of all nature, the Pelagians deny that men need to be saved. The Manichaeans do not rebuke concupiscence as a corruption of good nature, but as a separate evil nature; the Pelagians praise concupiscence as something naturally good. The former deny that evil comes from the free choice of the will, while the latter maintain that free will is sufficient to do good. The Manichaeans hold that the soul is a particle of God's nature intermingled with evil; the Pelagians say that the soul is a creature of God, but deny that it is burdened with sin.<sup>73</sup>

Both these mutually contradictory fallacies, however, reach the same erroneous conclusion in some points, says Augustine, namely, they both "attack the grace of Christ" (*gratiam Christi simul oppugnant*). The Manichaeans claim that the very human nature is divine; the Pelagians say that human nature is sufficient to perform good deeds. They both thus agree that men do not need grace. The Manichaeans are convinced that God must help his own nature, taken captive by evil; the Pelagians teach that God is obliged to reward the merits of his servants: in neither case is grace involved, but a payment of debt (*debitum*). According to the Manichaeans, baptism is of no advantage; the Pelagians maintain that baptism is of no avail to infants for the remission of sins: baptism thus loses its sense in both conceptions. The Manichaeans deny the birth of Christ from a virgin; the Pelagians regard our body as equal to his, i.e., free from sin: they both thus deny the exceptional dignity of Christ's sinless body.<sup>74</sup>

The main errors of the Manichaeans, in Augustine's opinion, include the denial of human nature, marriage and the law as good gifts of God, denial of the origin of evil in the will and denigration of the holy Old Testament patriarchs. The Pelagian position is erroneous as well, for they reject original sin, praise concupiscence and suppose that the law and free will are sufficient for salvation. Augustine tries to avoid both pitfalls by means of his doctrine on grace directed against both fallacious extremes. He maintains that men were created good, but as members of Adam's race are born with original sin and need redemption, which Manichaeism rejects as inefficacious and Pelagianism as unnecessary. According to Augustine, marriage is good in itself, but its goodness does not include carnal concupiscence, as this is an

<sup>73</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* II,2,2: CSEL 60, 461 f.

<sup>74</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* II,2,3: CSEL 60, 462 f. A certain affinity between Pelagianism and Manichaeism consisting in the emphasis on the self-redemption of man, the role of reason and good human nature is also identified by A. Magris, "Augustins Prädestinationslehre", 158 ff.

evil accidental (*accidens*) to good human nature. The law is good as well, for it reveals sin, but nobody will be justified by the law unless aided by grace. And finally, free will is sufficient for evil, but it must be made free by grace in order to do good.<sup>75</sup>

In his work addressed to Pope Boniface, Augustine makes an attempt at presenting Manichaeism and Pelagianism as two harmful extremes, while his theology is supposed to offer a middle solution, one which can preserve the importance of the “grace of Christ”. This he perceives as the freely given help of God, without which men are not capable of doing good because they are burdened with inherited guilt. Though inherited, the guilt does not originate in human nature, but in the human will. The remission of guilt is possible by means of baptism, through which men participate in the sinlessness of Christ himself; however, concupiscence as the consequence of the guilt lasts for the rest of their lives. Only grace, affecting the will with a delight in righteousness, gives men the power to struggle with concupiscence.

### 3.3. *Concupiscence and Guilt* (*Contra Iulianum*)

Julian of Eclanum replied to Augustine's polemic addressed to Valerius (*De nuptiis et concupiscentia I*) in the four books of *Ad Turbantium*, which have already been mentioned. At first, Augustine reacted to excerpts from it (*De nuptiis et concupiscentia II*), but then he felt the need to read it and disprove it *in extenso*. In order to be a match for Julian, he also responded in four books, which, on top of that, were introduced by two books of traditional evidence of the doctrine on original sin, recalling Irenaeus, Cyprian, Hilary (i.e., partially also Ambrosiaster), Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom and Jerome.<sup>76</sup> The six books of *Contra Iulianum* from 421 manifest a genuine attempt by Augustine to convince Julian (who is addressed here as a “beloved son”<sup>77</sup>) and show him the fallacy

<sup>75</sup> *Contra ep. Pel.* III,9,25; CSEL 60, 517 f.

<sup>76</sup> The evidence employed by Augustine is identified in NBA 18/1 (notes by N. Cipriani), 440–557; see also J. Lössl, *Intellectus*, 332–346. With these authors, however, the doctrine on sin transmitted in the human race does not necessarily imply the notion of guilt punishable from the very birth. See above, chap. III.3.1, nn. 43, 49, and below, chap. III.3.4, n. 171. On Augustine's reference to the consensus of patristic authors as a theological device already employed by Pelagius in *De natura*, one which Augustine used to reject, see E. Rebillard, “Augustin et ses autorités”.

<sup>77</sup> ... *dilecte fili Iuliane* (*Contra Iul.* III,1,1; NBA 18/1, 576).

of the Pelagian teaching, the naive optimism of which does not, according to Augustine, match the human condition in all its difficulty. The aim of finding a way between Pelagianism and Manichaeism as we already know it from Augustine's work for Pope Boniface sets off the human condition in its ambivalent tension between good creation and evil concupiscence, and between corrupted nature and rectifying grace.

The main errors of Pelagianism, according to Augustine, consist in the denial of original sin, the conviction that grace is given to men according to their merits, the notion of the possibility of sinlessness even in this life, and the teaching that infants do not necessarily need baptism.<sup>78</sup> These motifs, sharpened for the sake of the polemic by Augustine, make up a coherent doctrine on good human nature which cannot be corrupted by human sins as individual acts of the will, but may be perfected by good deeds of the will aided by God's grace.<sup>79</sup> The core of Augustine's reply might presumably be summarised along the lines that unfortunately, voluntary action may corrupt human nature and so it did.<sup>80</sup>

Augustine maintains as well that God is a good creator of good human nature; however, this nature committed sin in the first men. Thus nature itself (*natura*), not only the first men, became guilty because the guilt of the first men spreads like a contagion in the whole human race (*minores maiorum contagione sunt rei*). Although God did create men as good, men are now born guilty and burdened with vices, for which they also justly suffer in various ways from the moment they are born (otherwise the suffering of infants would be unjust, says Augustine<sup>81</sup>):

As if a bad action does not make the nature guilty (*naturam ream*)! The one who is guilty by reason of the action of a human being is the human being, and a human being is a nature. Just as adults are guilty by reason of the act of sinning, so the children are guilty by reason of infection (*contagione*) from the adults: the former because of what they do, the latter because of those from whom they take their origin. Therefore, that little ones are human beings is something good, because they would not exist at all, if he who is

<sup>78</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,1,2: NBA 18/1, 578; *Contra Iul.* III,1,4: NBA 18/1, 580.

<sup>79</sup> *Contra Iul.* II,9,31: NBA 18/1, 558; *Contra Iul.* III,5,11: NBA 18/1, 590; *Contra Iul.* IV,3,15: NBA 18/1, 676.

<sup>80</sup> ... peccato illo magno universam in deterius mutatam fuisse naturam, unde fuerat pro-pago ducenda ... ex maledicto in peius totam mutatam fuisse naturam, unde trahitur originale peccatum et iugum grave super filios Adam (*Contra Iul.* III,26,60: NBA 18/1, 648). ... ita ut illo vulnere quod factum est per duorum hominum liberum arbitrium, totum genus claudicaret humanum (*Contra Iul.* IV,16,83: NBA 18/1, 764).

<sup>81</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,5,11: NBA 18/1, 590; *Contra Iul.* VI,21,67: NBA 18/1, 958.



supremely good had not created them. But if they did not contract any evil from their origin, they would never be born with defects, even with those of the body.<sup>82</sup>

Men are not guilty of their being;<sup>83</sup> they remain good and their being is desirable, but their actual existence is burdened with guilt, and the human race is a mass of perdition (*massa perditionis*),<sup>84</sup> as we already know.

And yet, it is not a matter of a mixture of good and evil natures, as the Manichaeans have it, but something much worse and more difficult to remove: a corruption or weakness (*vulnus, languor*) of good nature itself.<sup>85</sup> This is not a separate thing, but something “in the subject” (*in subiecto*), i.e., an accidental corruption of nature. Just as black Ethiopians have black sons, says Augustine, so corruption is passed on to the offspring as a quality of nature: not through an accidental act of transmission from one subject to another (just as a tunic is passed on), but through nature itself as its “affection” and “contagion” (*affectione et contagione pertranseunt*).<sup>86</sup> The father’s disease may become part of his son’s nature even if it resulted from an accident (e.g. visual impairment), as Augustine objects to Julian’s conviction that accidents cannot change human nature.<sup>87</sup>

This hereditary disease (*morbus*) is concupiscence<sup>88</sup> as a punishment for the sin of the first men. It is inherited in the form of a punishment (disobedience of the body against the spirit), but because of the libidinous nature of procreation, guilt is transmitted with the punishment as well, as

---

<sup>82</sup> *Quasi et actio mala faciat nisi naturam ream. Actione quippe qui reus est hominis, homo est; homo autem natura est. Homines igitur, sicut peccati actione maiores, ita minores maiorum contagione sunt rei: isti ex eo quod faciunt, illi ex quibus originem ducunt. Quocirca in parvulis bonum est, quod homines sunt; quod omnino non essent, nisi eos ille qui summe bonus est creavisset. Malum vero si nullum ex origine traherent, numquam cum vitiis vel corporalibus nascerentur* (*Contra Iul.* III,6,13: NBA 18/1, 592–594). English translation by R.J. Teske, 346.

<sup>83</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,7,14: NBA 18/1, 594.

<sup>84</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,4,10: NBA 18/1, 590.

<sup>85</sup> *Quod malum ne dicamus cum Manichaeis tamquam ex aliena mali natura nobis esse commixtum, restat ut in nostra natura tamquam vulnus aliquod fateamur esse sanandum, cuius reatum iam fatemur regeneratione sanatum* (*Contra Iul.* V,16,65: NBA 18/1, 852). *Neque enim nullus est languor, quo caro concupiscit adversus spiritum ... Hoc quippe unde nunc agimus, quod nobis resistere sentimus in nobis, aut aliena est natura separanda, aut nostra sananda. Si alienam dicimus separandam, Manichaeis favemus. Fateamur ergo nostram esse sanandam, ut Manichaeos simul Pelagianosque vitemus* (*Contra Iul.* VI,18,57: NBA 18/1, 940).

<sup>86</sup> *Sic et vitia cum sint in subiecto, ex parentibus tamen in filios, non quasi transmigratione de suo subiecto in subiectum alterum, quod fieri non posse ...; sed, quod non intellegis, affectione et contagione pertranseunt* (*Contra Iul.* V,14,51: NBA 18/1, 838).

<sup>87</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,6,16: NBA 18/1, 882–884.

<sup>88</sup> ... istam concupiscentiam morbum esse dico (*Contra Iul.* III,15,29: NBA 18/1, 612–614).

Augustine already held in his earlier works. Having been freed from inherited guilt, baptised parents transmit a disease they themselves do not even suffer from any longer, although they still suffer from the consequences.

Just as sins which already passed in the act (*actu*) last in the form of guilt (*reatu*), so may concupiscence last in the act (*actu*), says Augustine, even if its nature of guilt (*reatus*) has been cancelled by baptism. The act of concupiscence is not this unpropitious quality itself pertaining to human nature or an act to which men were seduced by concupiscence, but a desire (*desiderium*) as a motion (*motus*) aroused by the desired thing which entered the human senses or the mind. Concupiscence as a quality (*qualitas*) then changes into an act which the human mind (*mens*) may face or succumb to. Only in the latter case does the act of concupiscence reach its effect (*effectus*).<sup>89</sup>

Augustine actually distinguishes four aspects of concupiscence: (i) the sinister quality of corrupted nature and (ii) the act, which differ as an “affective quality” (*affectionalis qualitas*) and the “affect” (*affectio*) itself (e.g. timidity and a fit of fear; wrathfulness and a fit of anger);<sup>90</sup> (iii) the effect (*effectus*) into which the act of concupiscence is transformed if the mind consents to it, and (iv) the guilty nature (*reatus*) of concupiscence.

And yet, according to Augustine, guilt does not pertain to men only through the actualisation and the effect of concupiscence, but it is the innate quality of concupiscence before its actualisation which bears the guilt of corrupted origin (*origo vitiata efficit reos*).<sup>91</sup> The subject of guilt is not concupiscence (which is not a separate subject at all), but the man afflicted with it.<sup>92</sup> The question arises of “where” the guilt (of both the corrupted origin and the actualised and performed concupiscence) dwells: it is not an accident of the body or the spirit; it is there even if men do not know about it or have forgotten about their own deeds. Guilt must be “located”

<sup>89</sup> *Quiddam vero tale est carnis concupiscentia, ut maneat in homine, secum per continentiam confligente, quamvis eius reatus qui fuerat generatione contractus, iam sit regeneratione transactus. Actu enim manet non quidem abstrahendo et illiciendo mentem, eiusque consensu concipiendo et pariendo peccata; sed mala, quibus mens resistat, desideria commovendo. Ipse quippe motus actus est eius, quamvis mente non consentiente desit effectus. Inest enim homini malum et praeter istum actum, id est, praeter hunc motum, unde surgit hic motus; quem motum dicimus desiderium. ... fieri potest ut insit qualitas mala, sed nulla sit tentatione commota; sicut inest timiditas homini timido, et quando non timet (Contra Iul. VI,19,60: NBA 18/1, 946).*

<sup>90</sup> *Contra Iul. VI,18,54: NBA 18/1, 936.*

<sup>91</sup> *Contra Iul. VI,24,79: NBA 18/1, 972; see also Contra Iul. III,21,46: NBA 18/1, 632.*

<sup>92</sup> *Contra Iul. VI,17,51: NBA 18/1, 932.*

elsewhere than with concupiscence as its source; it is a kind of promissory note kept not in man himself, but preserved in the “hidden laws of God which are somehow written in the minds of the angels”, and as such will be punished. Cancelling the guilt actually means cancelling the “list of charges” (*chirographus*) in the divine book of accounts.<sup>93</sup>

Redemption in Christ, in which men participate through baptism, involves not only the cancellation of the promissory note of guilt (as the Pelagians have it<sup>94</sup>), but also the remedy of the consequences inherent in human nature. But because concupiscence is a disease of nature and a punishment for its own guilt, not only a heterogeneous admixture, it is very difficult to heal it.<sup>95</sup> Moreover, in this “mortal body” men cannot remove it completely, says Augustine, although they may struggle with it if supported by grace. The conflict of the body and mind (*conflictus, agon*) as presented by the apostle Paul (Rom. 7:23; Gal. 5:17) is, according to this account, typical of the situation of a man supported by grace and him only: he who is not aided by grace is enslaved by concupiscence instead of struggling with it, not to mention overcoming it (even if he performed a good deed, Augustine holds, what decides is the intention, *propter quod, finis*,<sup>96</sup> given by the good will, i.e., love, which only comes from God<sup>97</sup>). And yet, even when a man supported by grace performs good deeds, he cannot “bring to perfection” (*perficere*) the good things in his mortal body, i.e., cannot eliminate concupiscence entirely.<sup>98</sup>

The disease of nature is not a mere bad habit, as the Pelagians have it in their account of the “law” of the sin “in my members”,<sup>99</sup> or a fallacy

<sup>93</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,19,62: NBA 18/1, 948–950.

<sup>94</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,23,72: NBA 18/1, 962–964.

<sup>95</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,19,62: NBA 18/1, 950.

<sup>96</sup> ... *non officiis, sed finibus a vitiis discernendas esse virtutes. Officium est autem quod faciendum est: finis vero propter quod faciendum est. Cum itaque facit homo aliquid ubi peccare non videtur, si non propter hoc facit propter quod facere debet, peccare convincitur* (*Contra Iul.* IV,3,21: NBA 18/1, 688).

<sup>97</sup> ... *qui non facit opera bona intentione fidei bonae, hoc est, eius quae per dilectionem operatur, totum quasi corpus, quod illis, velut membris, operibus constat, tenebrosum esse, hoc est, plenum nigredine peccatorum. ... nos illud bonum hominum dicere, illam voluntatem bonam, illud opus bonum, sine Dei gratia quae datur per unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum, nemini posse conferri* (*Contra Iul.* IV,3,33: NBA 18/1, 702–704). In this connection (*Contra Iul.* IV,3,24: NBA 18/1, 690–692), Augustine also quotes the line from Rom. 14:23b, to which, however, he attributes a somewhat different meaning than the apostle himself; see A.C. de Veer, “Rom. 14,23b dans l’œuvre de saint Augustin (*Omne quod non est ex fide, peccatum est*)”, in: *Recherches augustiniennes*, 8, 1972, 149–185.

<sup>98</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,26,62: NBA 18/1, 650–652.

<sup>99</sup> *Contra Iul.* II,3,5: NBA 18/1, 516–518; *Contra Iul.* VI,23,73: NBA 18/1, 964–966.

removable through reason. While other vices, e.g. idolatry, may be abandoned if one reaches the conclusion that they are godless, concupiscence cannot be removed in such a way. Although we know that the desires aroused by concupiscence are dubious, such a knowledge (*scientia*) in itself is not enough for their elimination. They must be fought against so that they could be controlled and set right (*refrenare*), though not rooted out, as this is not possible in the mortal body.<sup>100</sup>

Despite its ineradicability, Augustine does not regard concupiscence, or the libido, as part of human nature; it is not a part of the soul (as the Platonists might have it),<sup>101</sup> or a “vital fire” (*ignis vitalis*), good and natural in its character of desire (*appetitus*) and evil only if excessive, as Julian maintains (presumably inspired by the Stoics).<sup>102</sup> In Augustine’s opinion, concupiscence, which defies the will, is definitely evil (*malum*), a disease (*morbus*) which must be cured.<sup>103</sup>

The cure can only be provided by grace, as, according to Augustine, follows from the apostle’s account in Romans 7. The coming of the divine mediator, who was the only one not to “owe” anything,<sup>104</sup> thus brings about not only a cancellation of the promissory note and a remission of guilt, but also a recovery of nature itself, which the mediator, because of his miraculous birth from a virgin, accepted in its original, unvitiated form without the deadly disease. His sinlessness is not just an example for men,

<sup>100</sup> *Nullo modo, inquam, simile est sacrificium transiens manenti concupiscentiae, quae hominem iam non committentem quod solet ei consentiendo committere, iam plena fide et cognitione retinentem non esse talia facienda, stimulis tamen illicitorum desideriorum, quibus resistit castitas, inquietare non cessat: neque scientia finitur, ut non sit; sed continentia refrenatur, ut quo tendit pervenire non possit. ... quamvis reatus malae concupiscentiae eodem Baptismate sit solutus; manet tamen ipsa, donec ab eo qui post eiecta daemonia perficit sanitates, medicina perficiente sanetur* (*Contra Iul.* VI,19,61: NBA 18/1, 948). As P. Fredriksen points out, Augustine denies the Pelagian moral perfectionism drawing from ancient sources and based on the optimistic notion concerning the power of the will and on anthropological dualism, according to which man, in the proper sense, is only soul (see P. Fredriksen, “Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy”, 112).

<sup>101</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,18,53: NBA 18/1, 934.

<sup>102</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,13,26–27: NBA 18/1, 608–610; see also *Contra Iul.* IV,2,8: NBA 18/1, 666. Regarding the Stoic teaching on *calor vitalis*, see Cicero, *De nat. deorum*, II,24; 27; 41. See also M. Lambergts, “The Philosophical and Theological Background of Julian of Aeclanum’s Concept of Concupiscence”, in: Th. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008, 245–260.

<sup>103</sup> *Contra Iul.* III,14,28–15,29: NBA 18/1, 612–614.

<sup>104</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,19,62: NBA 18/1, 950.

as Julian has it, but a recovery of human nature,<sup>105</sup> an establishment of a new race in which paternal guilt is not transmitted any more, but where every man is born without any burden as an adoptive son of God himself. “Death to sin” and the birth of a new man at baptism mean becoming “a new father” through adoption, a “new heritage” and liberation from inherited guilt.<sup>106</sup> This is not just a “seeming” change (*quasi*), as Julian objects against Augustine,<sup>107</sup> although the old heritage is not eliminated all at once and its consequences last. Men are not regenerated and saved “seemingly” (*quasi*), even though they are saved only “in hope” (cf. Rom. 8:24) and will be saved entirely in a new body which is not subject to death.<sup>108</sup>

In the first six books against Julian (from which only some aspects are mentioned here because the core of the polemic has already been presented), Augustine mainly elaborates on the ambivalence of the human condition. Men are not just good beings pursuing the good with the help of God and erring by mistake, as the Pelagians have it; nor are they a mixture of good and evil natures which should and can be separated again, as the Manichaeans teach. In Augustine’s opinion, it is not true that evil cannot come from good, but only from evil, as both groups maintain.<sup>109</sup> He holds that human beings are good, though entangled in evil as a result of their will, which corrupted their nature in the form of concupiscence. They are good and evil at the same time, so to speak; evil is not a heterogeneous admixture, but an inner disease, hardly separable from nature itself. Not even Christian redemption can eliminate this ambivalence immediately, even though it changes the human condition in a radical way. A baptised man becomes free from inherited guilt, but keeps struggling with its enduring consequences; he is only saved “in this hope”, hoping for complete salvation, but unable to experience it in his mortal body. What he may experience, says Augustine, is the aid of grace; without such a support he would not even be able to struggle at all. It is grace as a remedy for concupiscence which reveals the true nature of the human condition because—seemingly paradoxically—only after a man has been endowed with grace can he say: “O wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?” (Rom. 7:24)

<sup>105</sup> *Contra Iul.* V,15,58: NBA 18/1, 844. See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* III, frag. 220: CCL 88, 382.

<sup>106</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,26,83: NBA 18/1, 980.

<sup>107</sup> See Julian of Eclanum, *Ad Turb.* IV, frag. 284: CCL 88, 388.

<sup>108</sup> *Contra Iul.* VI,14,44–15,45: NBA 18/1, 920–922.

<sup>109</sup> *Contra Iul.* I,9,42: NBA 18/1, 502.

3.4. *Enslaved Freedom* (Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum)

The expression of Augustine's and Julian's divergent ideas concerning the human condition became the most dramatic in the last round of the polemic, in Julian's eight books *Ad Florum* (already written in his exile in Asia Minor) and in Augustine's unfinished reaction in six books, *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*, from between 429 and 430. Augustine quotes Julian's statements *in extenso*, trying to refute them (that is why the first six books of *Ad Florum*, to which Augustine managed to react, are preserved); these passages often already include quotations from Augustine's work. The reader thus follows Julian's text interrupted by a polemic or glosses written by Augustine. In the meantime, the tone of the polemic had changed considerably: the aim is no longer to convince one another, but rather to reveal the indefensibility of the opponent's position or simply ridicule him. While Julian writes for a limited circle of educated readers, building his argumentation on the principles of ancient rhetoric and philosophical logic with a number of insightful allusions to classical authors, Augustine intentionally opts for a language and argumentation drawing on folk religiosity, openly ridiculing the sophisticated form of his opponent.<sup>110</sup> With respect to the preceding polemic, the subject matter of the argument is not new, although certain partial specifications do appear here.

Julian of Eclanum maintains—which may be regarded as the core of his polemic—that the human condition as men experience it is a good work of a good God;<sup>111</sup> it is an opportunity for men as free beings to either do well or fail, and thus decide with their own will about their destiny:

Freedom of choice in which a human being has received emancipation by God consists in the possibility (*possibilitas*) of committing sin and of refraining from sin. ... The rational mortal animal was made capable of virtue and vice so that it is able by the ability granted to it to observe or to transgress the commandments of God or to preserve the law of human society by the teaching of nature. It is free to will one or the other alternative, and in that lies the essence of sin and righteousness.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>110</sup> On the style of both authors, aptly reflecting their theological differences, see D. Weber, "Klassische Literatur im Dienst theologischer Polemik: Julian von Eclanum, *Ad Florum*," in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 503–509. On Julian's brilliant stylistics, drawing on ancient rhetorical models, see also N. Cipriani, "Aspetti letterari dell'*Ad Florum* di Giuliano d'Eclano", in: *Augustinianum*, 15, 1975, 125–167.

<sup>111</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,158: CSEL 85/1, 462. According to Julian, human nature is good; the possibility of evil consists in the will (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,59: CSEL 85/2, 268).

<sup>112</sup> *Libertas arbitrii, qua a Deo emancipatus homo est, in ammittendi peccati et abstinendi a peccato possibilitate consistit. ... Factum est enim animal rationale, mortale, capax virtutis*

Freedom of choice, then, is the capability (*possibilitas*) of committing or of avoiding sin, immune from compelling necessity; it has in its own power (*in suo iure*) which path it will follow of the two that suggest themselves, that is, either the arduous and difficult paths of the virtues or the low and swampy paths of the pleasures.<sup>113</sup>

Julian does not draw a sharp line between Adam's position in paradise and the present human condition,<sup>114</sup> regarding Adam's story as a paradigm of the stories of all men, in which naturally mortal free beings may either obey God's commandments and attain eternal life, or deserve eternal death because of their disobedience. Each man is responsible for himself; the guilt of one does not afflict others, although the behaviour of each man sets an example for others and thus influences their actions to some extent as well. The sin which entered the world through Adam (Rom. 5:12) is regarded by Julian as a bad example (*exemplum*) and a sinister influence.<sup>115</sup> Unlike Augustine,<sup>116</sup> Julian does not interpret *in quo omnes peccaverunt* in this line as a reference to Adam, "in whom" (*in quo*) all sinned, but (more correctly with respect to the Greek text) as an explanation: "because" (*in quo* = *quia, quoniam*) all sinned.<sup>117</sup> That is why Julian strictly rejects Augustine's notion of sin transmitted in procreation, arguing that sin is related to the spirit, not to the body, and is transmitted by imitation (*imitatio*):<sup>118</sup> it is a matter

---

*et vitii, quod posset ex concessa sibi possibilitate vel servare Dei mandata vel transgredi vel magisterio naturali conservare ius humanae societatis liberumque haberet alterutram velle partem, in quo peccati et iustitiae summa est (Contra Iul. imp. I,78–79: CSEL 85/1, 93 f.).* English translation after R.J. Teske, 108 f. As M. Lamberigts rightly points out, *emancipatus a Deo* must be understood along the lines of "he was endowed with the gift of emancipation by God", not as "he emancipated himself from God" (see M. Lamberigts, "Julian of Aeclanum on Grace: Some Considerations", in: *StPatr* 27, 1993, 342–349, here 349).

<sup>113</sup> *Libertas igitur arbitrii possibilitas est vel ammittendi vel vitandi peccati expers cogentis necessitatis, quae in suo utpote iure habet, utrum suggerentium partem sequatur, id est vel ardua asperaque virtutum vel demersa et palustria voluptatum (Contra Iul. imp. I,82: CSEL 85/1, 96).* English translation by R.J. Teske, 110.

<sup>114</sup> *Si peccatum quod Adam commisit, voluntate susceptum est et potuit fieri naturale, cur non haec quae fiunt cotidie peccata, quae voluntas criminosa committit, in deformitatem et praeiudicia seminum congeruntur? Quod si ista non minus atrocia quam plura ingenerari nequeunt, qua lege, qua conditione, quo privilegio illud solum vindicatur ingenuum? (Contra Iul. imp. VI,21: CSEL 85/2, 362).* On the different interpretations of Adam's story by Julian and Augustine, see M. Lamberigts, "Julien d'Éclane et Augustin d'Hippone. Deux conceptions d'Adam", in: *Augustiniana*, 40, 1990, 373–410.

<sup>115</sup> *Contra Iul. imp. II,47: CSEL 85/1, 195 f.*

<sup>116</sup> See above, chap. III.1.1, n. 38.

<sup>117</sup> *Contra Iul. imp. II,174: CSEL 85/1, 294.*

<sup>118</sup> *Contra Iul. imp. II,52: CSEL 85/1, 200; Contra Iul. imp. II,61: CSEL 85/1, 207 f.*

of “morals, not seed” (*morum, ... non seminum*)<sup>119</sup> and cannot be transmitted “through the seed”.<sup>120</sup>

The punishment for the sin of the first men may afflict the whole human race (cf. Gen. 3:16–19), but it does not mean that all men are burdened with their guilt.<sup>121</sup> Each man is only guilty on account of his own voluntary deeds; nobody can be both guilty and not guilty, i.e., just and unjust, because these opposites exclude each other and there is nothing in between them (*medium*), as Julian knows from the Stoics.<sup>122</sup>

Just as death is a natural part of the human condition, so is the birth of new men: it is because of the fragile finiteness of men that the changing of generations exists, through which the human race continues:

If, then, by the testimony of Christ who established it (Matt. 19:5–6), fertility was created for the purpose of combating our frailty and if this condition of marriage was established before the sin (cf. Gen. 2:24), it is clear that mortality does not have to do with the transgression, but with the nature with which we read that marriage also has to do.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>119</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,194: CSEL 85/1, 309.

<sup>120</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,11: CSEL 85/1, 355; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,46: CSEL 85/1, 386. E.A. Clark, “Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine’s Manichean Past”, in: eadem, *Ascetic Piety and Women’s Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Lewiston 1986, 291–349.

<sup>121</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,25: CSEL 85/2, 380 f.

<sup>122</sup> *Facilius ergo res diversae et contrariae negari possunt pariter quam pariter approbari. Ista autem contraria, quae medium non habent, ut puta bonum et malum, iustum et iniustum, innocentia et reatus, ut uno tempore in unum atque idem convenire non possunt, ita necesse est, ut altero eorum posito alterum denegetur, id est, ut vel praeceptum vel consilium vel adiumentum non potest simul uno tempore et iustum et iniustum esse, ita et homo non potest uno eodemque tempore et reus et innocens et bonus et malus esse* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,32: CSEL 85/1, 370 f.). Also in Stoic ethics, there is no middle ground between virtue and vice; see Diogenes Laertius on the Stoics: Ἀρέσκει δ’ αὐτοῖς μηδὲν μεταξύ εἶναι ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας, τῶν Περιπατητικῶν μεταξύ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας εἶναι λεγόντων τὴν προκοπὴν· ὥς γὰρ δεῖν φασιν ἢ ὀρθὸν εἶναι ξύλον ἢ στρεβλόν, οὕτως ἢ δίκαιον ἢ ἄδικον, οὐτε δὲ δικαιοτέρον οὐτ’ ἄδικωτέρον ... (*Vitae*, VII,127). Similarly also Plutarch, *De comm. not.* 9, 1062b4–8; 10, 1063a5–b1. In contrast, Aristotle maintains that the pair “just-unjust” (δίκαιον-ἄδικον) is an example of contrary opposites (τὰ ἐναντία), which do allow of a third possibility, though one which has no name; see *Categoriae* 10, 12a17–25.

<sup>123</sup> *Si ergo Christo teste qui condidit fertilitas ob hoc creata est, ut cum fragilitate confligeret, et haec conditio nuptiarum ante peccatum ordinata est, apparet quoque mortalitatem non ad praevericationem spectare sed ad naturam, ad quam spectare leguntur et nuptiae* (*Contra Iul. imp.* VI,30: CSEL 85/2, 416 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 690. On “Adam” as the name of human nature, to which mortality pertains as well, see also *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,31: CSEL 85/2, 422 f. On Julian’s notion of death, see J.-M. Girard, *La mort*, 171–179.



Carnal procreation involving concupiscence is also a natural part of the human condition, just as it is part of the condition of other animals.<sup>124</sup> The shame related to it does not indicate its perversity, but sets boundaries to what is decent and what is not under certain circumstances.<sup>125</sup>

A great grace (*gratia*) was already given to men in their creation from nothing and in the gift of the image of God in human rationality (*ratio*) and freedom (*libertas*). The law given to the Jewish people is also a gift from God, one helping men to know what ought to be done and what should be avoided. God's grace or goodness (*gratiae, id est divinae benevolentiae*) grew to its fullest flowering in the incarnation of the Son of God, who enables men to participate in his own heritage.<sup>126</sup> Being in the same situation as men, he managed to avoid sin and thus opened the possibility for men to attain salvation on condition that they imitate him.<sup>127</sup> His birth from a virgin is a sign (*signum*)<sup>128</sup> that salvation transcending human nature comes in him, not an accusation of human nature as such.

<sup>124</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,122: CSEL 85/1, 253; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,25: CSEL 85/2, 26; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,38: CSEL 85/2, 37–39; *Contra Iul. imp.* V,5: CSEL 85/2, 172. On Julian's view of sexuality, which (unlike that of Augustine) fully corresponds to ancient medicine and the Christian morality of his time, see P. Brown, "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum", in: *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. E. Gabba, Como 1983, 49–70.

<sup>125</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,37: CSEL 85/2, 35 f. Julian was already concerned with the issue of shame in his previous work *Ad Turbantium* (II, frag. 138: CCL 88, 369 f.; II, frag. 149–153: CCL 88, 371 f.; III, frag. 159–164: CCL 88, 373 f.); see also *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,30: CSEL 85/2, 29.

<sup>126</sup> *Gratiam ergo Christi multiplicem confitemur: primum munus eius est, quod facti ex nihilo sumus. Secundum, quod ut viventibus sensu ita sentientibus ratione praestamus, quae impressa est animo, ut conditoris imago doceretur, ad cuius aequae respicit dignitatem arbitrii concessa libertas. Ipsi etiam gratiae beneficiorum, quae nobis praestare non desinit, augmenta reputamus; ipsa gratia legem in adiutorium misit (Isa. 8:20 LXX); ad eius spectabat officium, ut rationis lumen, quod pravitatis exempla hebetabant et consuetudo vitiorum, multimodis eruditionibus excitaret, atque imitatos suos foveret; ad istius ergo gratiae, id est divinae benevolentiae, quae rebus causam dedit, plenitudinem spectavit, ut verbum careretur et habitaret in nobis (cf. John 1:14). Reposcens enim Deus ab imagine sua amoris vicem ... pollicens, quia, si voluissemus deinceps voluntati eius obedire, unigeniti sui praestaret nos esse cohaeredit (cf. Rom. 8:17) (Contra Iul. imp. I,94: CSEL 85/1, 109). On Julian's concept of grace, see M. Lamberigts, "Julian of Aeclanum on Grace"; idem, "Julian von Aeclanum und seine Sicht der Gnade: Eine Alternative?", in: C. Mayer, A.E.J. Grote, Ch. Müller (eds.), *Gnade—Freiheit—Rechtfertigung. Augustinische Topoi und ihre Wirkungsgeschichte (Internationales Kolloquium zum 1650. Geburtstag Augustins vom 25. bis 27. November 2004 im Erbacher Hof zu Mainz)*, Mainz—Stuttgart 2007, 95–122.*

<sup>127</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,49: CSEL 85/2, 53 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,87: CSEL 85/2, 88 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,31: CSEL 85/2, 423; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,34: CSEL 85/2, 429. On the overcoming of sins through the imitation of Christ's death, see *Contra Iul. imp.* II,223: CSEL 85/1, 336 f.

<sup>128</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,66: CSEL 85/1, 64; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,53: CSEL 85/2, 58.

Christian baptism is administered as a gift of a new life of the sons of God; it brings to perfection the natural life and, at the same time, represents (in the case of adults) a remedy (*medicina*) and a remission of sins.<sup>129</sup> In bestowing life, the grace of God not only forgives but also brings illumination (*illuminatio*) and sanctification (*sanctificatio*), turning men into members of the body of Christ and sons of God, which they are not naturally, despite being good by nature.<sup>130</sup> And yet, God does not act on behalf of men in their actions which decide about their destiny, but helps those who are willing to the extent to which they are willing to accept his help:

... [W]e state that God makes human beings with free choice and helps them by countless forms of divine grace so that it is possible for them to keep the commandments of God or to break them. And this is why we maintain that there is free choice: Since God shows his goodness in so many ways, that is, by commanding, blessing, sanctifying, restraining, challenging, and enlightening, all those who already have the use of reason have the freedom either to observe or to reject the will of God.<sup>131</sup>

Julian does not hesitate to say that men can hinder God's aim of saving all men, which is unacceptable for Augustine.<sup>132</sup> If the ultimate responsibility for their own actions did not lie with men themselves, they could not be judged justly. Each man becomes a “vessel of wrath” or “shame” on his own; this destiny was not predestined by God for anyone:

... [M]y God forms no one for a dishonorable purpose. ... He creates his image, that is, all human beings, good, and he desires to form again by the generosity of his remedies even those who were destroyed by the wickedness of their

<sup>129</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,151: CSEL 85/1, 456; see also *Contra Iul. imp.* V,9: CSEL 85/2, 177.

<sup>130</sup> ... *et quos fecerat condendo bonos, facit innovando adoptandoque meliores. Hanc igitur gratiam, per quam reis venia, illuminatio spiritalis, adoptio filiorum Dei, municipatus Hierusalem caelestis, sanctificatio atque in Christi membra translatio et possessio regni caelorum mortalibus datur ...* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,53: CSEL 85/1, 49).

<sup>131</sup> ... *affirmamus a Deo fieri hominem liberi arbitrii eumque innumeris divinae gratiae speciebus iuvare, cui possibile sit vel servare Dei mandata vel transgredi. Et hoc est, ubi liberum arbitrium esse defendimus, ut, cum Deus tam multis modis benignitatem suam asserat, id est praecipiendo benedicendo sanctificando cohercendo provocando illuminando, unusquisque eorum, qui iam ratione utitur, liberum habeat voluntatem Dei vel servare vel spernere* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,106: CSEL 85/1, 426). English translation by R.J. Teske, 334. See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105f.

<sup>132</sup> *Audi sane, ubi vim humanae libertatis ostendit ... atque omnibus vehementius, quod dicit intentionem suam humana voluntate impeditam fuisse: Hierusalem, inquit, Hierusalem, quotiens volui congregare filios tuos sicut gallina pullos suos sub alas suas et noluisti?* (Matt. 23:37) (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105).

actions. ... [H]e is both good to those who have not sinned and punishes by his just judgment those who, though created good by God, sinned by their own will and rejected the helps of his mercy.<sup>133</sup>

As for Augustine's notion of sin as "natural" and inherited evil and the freedom of choice as "enslaved" (*captivum*<sup>134</sup>), Julian regards it as a Manichaean fallacy (*qui ex sententia Manicheorum traducem peccati id est malum naturale defenderent*<sup>135</sup>):

Mani says that a bad will is inspired by that nature which cannot will good, but a good will is infused by that nature which cannot will evil. In that way he, of course, imposes on the natures of individual beings the necessity of some action so that their own wills cannot will the opposite. ... You say that the will is free, but only to do evil and that it is not free to stop doing evil, unless the necessity of willing good is imposed on it by that nature which, to use your words, "cannot will evil."<sup>136</sup>

In order to support this claim, he draws on a Latin work attributed to Mani, called *Epistola ad filiam Menoch*, allegedly found in Constantinople<sup>137</sup>

<sup>133</sup> ... *Deum meum neminem in contumeliam formare. ... Sed imaginem suam, id est omnes homines bonos condere, qui etiam demolitos studiorum pravitate reformare remediorum desiderat largitate. ... et illis est benignus, qui nihil deliquerunt, et iusto punit iudicio eos, qui boni a Deo conditi suapte voluntate peccarunt ac misericordiae subsidia respuerunt* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,129–130: CSEL 85/1, 141). English translation by R.J. Teske, 137. See the whole passage in *Contra Iul. imp.* I,128–131: CSEL 85/1, 140–143.

<sup>134</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,85: CSEL 85/1, 97.

<sup>135</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,1: CSEL 85/1, 5.

<sup>136</sup> *Manicheus dicit voluntatem malam ab ea inspirari natura, quae bonum velle non potest, voluntatem vero bonam ab ea infundi natura, quae malum velle non potest; ita utique naturis singularum rerum imponit necessitatem, ut propriae voluntates non possint velle contraria. ... Dicis esse liberam voluntatem, sed ut malum tantummodo faciat, non autem esse in hoc liberam, ut malum desistat operari, nisi ei fuerit imposita necessitas volendi bonum ab ea natura, quae, ut tuis utar sermonibus, "malum non potest velle"* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,97: CSEL 85/1, 112 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 120. See also e.g. *Contra Iul. imp.* II,226: CSEL 85/1, 340 f. Among others, Julian was presumably inspired in his polemic by an anti-Manichaean treatise by Serapion of Thmuis; see N. Cipriani, "L'autore dei testi pseudobasiliani riportati nel *C. Iulianum* (I, 16–17) e la polemica agostiniana di Giuliano d'Eclano", in: *Congresso internazionale su s. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione, Roma, 15–20 settembre 1986: Atti*, I, Roma 1987, 439–449.

<sup>137</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,166: CSEL 85/1, 469. As Augustine's quotations in *Contra Iul. imp.* III,172–187: CSEL 85/1, 473–488 show, Julian excerpts this letter (see also a reference in *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,109: CSEL 85/2, 116). For recent research, the letter is a hard nut to crack. In the extant list of Mani's letters there are two addressed to "a Persian woman named Mainaq" (n. 60–61), who is also a co-addressee of another one (see O. Klíma, *Manis Zeit und Leben*, Praha 1962, 421–424). Mani's letters were found in Fayum in 1930 in a Coptic translation, but were unfortunately destroyed in Berlin in 1945 (see H.-Ch. Puech, "Le manichéisme", in: *Histoire des religions*, II, ed. idem, 549). On the (unresolved) issue of the authenticity of the letter

(Augustine himself says that he is not familiar with it<sup>138</sup>). According to Augustine, says Julian, men, created as good by God, are born in their physical birth under the devil's power,<sup>139</sup> just as according to the Manichaeans the goodness of the soul and the evil of the flesh are intermingled in human nature. In Augustine's opinion, as Julian goes on to say, this evil is transmitted through sexual concupiscence, just as in the opinion of the Manichaeans concupiscence forces men to act against their will.<sup>140</sup> According to both parties, the evil of concupiscence is mainly indicated by the shame which shrouds procreation.<sup>141</sup> The transmission of evil together with the transmission of the parents' soul to the children is a kind of fallacy related to Manichaeism, whose disciples Julian derogatorily calls "traducianists" (*traduciani*).<sup>142</sup> Augustine holds that the origin of evil, which the Manichaeans regard as a separate nature, is in "nothing", out of which men were created and which turned their wills towards evil. In both cases, it is a "violent" (*violenta*) force despite the fact that the Manichaeans regard it as a substance, while Augustine calls it "nothing".<sup>143</sup>

---

quoted by Julian, which may be regarded as a Manichaean pseudepigraph addressed to a mission in the Christian milieu (according to G.J.D. Aalders, *L'Épître à Menoch, attribuée à Mani*, in: *VCh* 14, 1960, 245–249), or even a Pelagian forgery, even though Mani's authorship cannot be quite excluded, either, see M. Stein, "Einleitung", in: *Epistula ad Menoch, Manichaica Latina*, 1, Opladen 1998, 28–43; the authenticity of the letter is advocated by G. Harrison—J. BeDuhn, "The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?)Mani's Letter to Menoch", in: *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, ed. P. Mirecki—J. BeDuhn, Leiden 2001, 128–172. In another passage Julian also refers to Mani's letter to Patticius (rather than Patricius); see *Contra Iul. imp.* III,186: CSEL 85/1, 484; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,109: CSEL 85/2, 116; *Contra Iul. imp.* V,25: CSEL 85/2, 217. This is probably a letter also known as *Epistola fundamenti*, in which the same addressee is given (see Augustine, *Contra ep. fund.* 12,14: BA 17, 420; see above, chap. II.3, introduction incl. n. 3). On Patticius' identity (presumably the Manichaean missionary Pattig) see M. Scopello, "L'*Epistula fundamenti*", 221–229. On the ensuing argumentation, in which Julian convicts Augustine of Manichaeism, see M. Lamberigts, "Was Augustine a Manichaean?", 120–134.

<sup>138</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,172: CSEL 85/1, 473.

<sup>139</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,62: CSEL 85/1, 58; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,90: CSEL 85/2, 94 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,120: CSEL 85/2, 134 f.

<sup>140</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,174: CSEL 85/1, 475; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,187: CSEL 85/1, 486 f.

<sup>141</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* V,30: CSEL 85/2, 225–227.

<sup>142</sup> See e.g. *Contra Iul. imp.* I,6: CSEL 85/1, 9; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,27: CSEL 85/1, 23; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,75: CSEL 85/1, 91; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,14: CSEL 85/1, 172; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,27: CSEL 85/1, 181. Julian associates the notion that the soul is "transmitted" from parents to children like the body with Tertullian and the Manichaeans (see *Contra Iul. imp.* II,178: CSEL 85/1, 297); he even finds it explicitly mentioned in *Epistola ad filiam Menoch* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,172–173: CSEL 85/1, 473 f.).

<sup>143</sup> *Hoc enim nihil, de quo facta sunt omnia, affirmas causam fuisse peccati. Tantum igitur facit apud te nihili huius potentia quantum apud Manicheum principis tenebrarum. Ambo ergo*

There are more fallacies in other parts of Augustine's teaching, says Julian; for example, his Christology is actually a Manichaean modification of Apollinarianism as long as he maintains that in the man Christ there was no concupiscence inherent in all men.<sup>144</sup> Augustine's teaching also has a most harmful impact on the moral judgement concerning human actions. If men are forced to sin by their nature, it cannot be attributed to them as their own guilt and they cannot be judged for it:

But God could not justly impute a sin if the person to whom it is imputed could not also avoid it. But no one can avoid what is natural; therefore, no one at all can have sin from the necessity of nature.<sup>145</sup>

For if the law of sin, that is, sin and the necessity of sinning is naturally implanted in our members, what good does it do not to consent to it, since it is necessary to undergo punishment on account of its very existence?<sup>146</sup>

If men are not able to reject evil on their own, they cannot be commanded to do so.<sup>147</sup> According to Julian, "sin is the will to do or to keep that which justice forbids and from which we are free to hold back" (a definition which, by the way, he borrowed from the early Augustine),<sup>148</sup> and that is why nobody is

---

*dicitis etiam primi mali necessitatem fuisse, sed dat ille soliditatem vel malam, tu inanitatem, aequae tamen malam; ille ergo dicit violentam substantiam, tu violentum aequae, sed nihilum* (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,32: CSEL 85/2, 231). The idea that the origin in nothing is the cause of human weakness is presented by J.M. Rist as a difference between Augustine and Plotinus, who regards their connection with the flesh as the source of the weakness of individual souls (see J.M. Rist, "Augustine", 441).

<sup>144</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,45–47: CSEL 85/2, 49–51. On the Christological issue in Augustine's controversy with Julian, which, nevertheless, was only a culmination of their anthropological dispute and in which neither party showed any divergence from the (pre-Ephesian) orthodoxy, see J. McW. Dewart, "The Christology", 1233–1241. However, the assertion that Julian shared the "Christology of grace" with his patron of that time, Theodore of Mopsuestia, just like Augustine, can hardly be supported by the extant texts. According to N. Cipriani, Julian drew the information concerning Apollinarianism, from which he accuses Augustine, from Theodore (see N. Cipriani, "Echi antiapollinaristici e aristotelismo nella polemica di Giuliano d'Eclano", in: *Augustinianum*, 21, 1981, 373–389). The position of Christology in the theological conceptions of both opponents is discussed by M. Lamberigts, "Competing Christologies: Julian and Augustine on Jesus Christ", in: *AugSt* 36/1, 2005, 159–194.

<sup>145</sup> ... non autem iure potuit imputare, si non illud cui imputatur potuit et cavere; nemo autem potest cavere naturalia; igitur nullus prorsus habere potest de naturae necessitate peccatum (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,67: CSEL 85/1, 69). English translation after R.J. Teske, 94.

<sup>146</sup> Nam si lex peccati id est peccatum et necessitas peccati membris est inserta naturaliter, quid prodest non ei praebere consensum, cum propter hoc ipsum quod est necesse sit subire supplicium? (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,71: CSEL 85/1, 81). English translation by R.J. Teske, 101.

<sup>147</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,70: CSEL 85/1, 78; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,119: CSEL 85/2, 132 f.

<sup>148</sup> Peccatum est voluntas amittendi vel retinendi, quod iustitia vetat et unde liberum est abstinere (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,44: CSEL 85/1, 31). English translation by R.J. Teske, 72. Cf. Augustine, *De duabus anim.* 11,15: BA 17, 92.

forced to it by some pressure of nature. In Julian's opinion, "nature" means "necessity".<sup>149</sup> To attribute one's transgression to hereditary necessity would mean the end of Christian morals.<sup>150</sup>

And furthermore, if unbaptised infants are rejected through no fault of their own, God is unjust, says Julian:

You say, "Little ones are not weighed down by any sin of their own, but they are weighed down by the sin of another." ... Who is there who is so mad, so cruel, so forgetful of God and of justice, so treacherous a barbarian as to pronounce these little ones guilty? ... Tell us, then, who is this condemner of innocents? You answer: God. You have utterly stunned us, but since such a great sacrilege scarcely merits belief, we are in doubt about what you meant. ... God himself, you say, who *manifests his love in us* (Rom. 5:8), ... is such a judge; he is the persecutor of the newborn; with bad will he hands over to eternal fire little ones whom he knows could not have either a good or a bad will.<sup>151</sup>

Righteousness means giving everyone their due, Julian holds, without cheating or favouritism.<sup>152</sup> However, Augustine apparently does not believe in a righteous God;<sup>153</sup> he even makes the judgements of God "barbarously unrighteous",<sup>154</sup> and his doctrine on grace denies the freedom of choice<sup>155</sup> through which men could attain virtue and thus determine their own eternal destiny.

<sup>149</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* V,46: CSEL 85/2, 250.

<sup>150</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,114: CSEL 85/2, 123. Julian's concept of sin is criticised as weak by Ph.L. Barclift, "In Controversy with Saint Augustine: Julian of Eclanum on the Nature of Sin", in: *RThAM* 58, 1991, 5–20.

<sup>151</sup> *Nullo, inquis, peccato parvuli premuntur suo, sed premuntur alieno. ... Quis ille fuit qui hos adiudicaret reos, tam excors, tam trux, tam oblitus Dei et aequitatis, barbarus perduellis? ... Pande igitur: quis est iste innocentium addictor? Respondens: Deus, percussisti quidem animum, sed quoniam vix tantum sacrilegium fidem meretur, quid dixeris ambigamus. ... Deus, ais, ipse qui commendat suam caritatem in nobis ..., ipse sic iudicat, ipse est nascentium persecutor, ipse pro mala voluntate aeternis ignibus parvulos tradit, quos nec bonam, nec malam voluntatem scit habere potuisse* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,48: CSEL 85/1, 36–38). English translation by R.J. Teske, 74 f. See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,57: CSEL 85/1, 54.

<sup>152</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,35: CSEL 85/1, 26; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,38: CSEL 85/1, 28; similarly also *Contra Iul. imp.* III,2: CSEL 85/1, 352. On Julian's Ciceronian notion of justice, which is different from Augustine's concept in this period, see A.E. McGrath, "Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum", in: *DR* 101, 1983, 312–319.

<sup>153</sup> *Miror enim ambigi de Dei aequitate potuisse, cum constet in Traducianorum synagogis nihil de eius iniquitate dubitari* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,7: CSEL 85/1, 354). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,50: CSEL 85/1, 42; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,2: CSEL 85/2, 5.

<sup>154</sup> *In iudiciis iniquitatem barbaram ...* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,77: CSEL 85/1, 405).

<sup>155</sup> *... arbitrium vos liberum denegare ...* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,94: CSEL 85/1, 107). *Quia liberum arbitrium ... infringit et destruit* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,69: CSEL 85/1, 403).

As a reaction to the criticism, justified to a large extent, Augustine elaborates for the last time on his theology of sin and grace, in which the motifs of theodicy present in his early works appear again. Above all, Augustine is convinced that the human condition as we experience it now is a mixture of misery and horror which cannot be a work of God. Men are born as slow and dull beings (*fatuus*),<sup>156</sup> often afflicted with bodily illnesses and deformities.<sup>157</sup> The very process of birth is difficult,<sup>158</sup> making a living is hard,<sup>159</sup> existence is fleeting<sup>160</sup> and death bitter.<sup>161</sup> Moreover, human beings are divided between their own will and concupiscence as the “law in my members”<sup>162</sup> (this split does not exist with animals, for which “concupiscence” is not a punishment for sin, but part of their nature<sup>163</sup>). Is this the Pelagian idea of the paradise where God put man (Gen. 2:8)? One should paint a parody of all these sorrows and horrors and call it a “Pelagian paradise” (*paradisus Pelagianorum*), says Augustine mockingly.<sup>164</sup> He is deeply convinced that the misery

<sup>156</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,160–161: CSEL 85/1, 464–466.

<sup>157</sup> In spite of John 9:2–3, Augustine interprets congenital deformities as a consequence of sin; see *Contra Iul. imp.* I,116: CSEL 85/1, 133 f.

<sup>158</sup> According to Augustine’s exposition of Gen. 3:16, labour during childbirth is a punishment for sin as well (*Contra Iul. imp.* VI,26: CSEL 85/2, 387–393).

<sup>159</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,27: CSEL 85/2, 397–401.

<sup>160</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,36: CSEL 85/1, 26 f.

<sup>161</sup> Augustine insists that physical death is not part of human nature, but a punishment for sin; the fact that human nature fears it is also part of the punishment (*Contra Iul. imp.* II,186: CSEL 85/1, 304; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,14: CSEL 85/2, 332; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,27: CSEL 85/2, 399–403). See also above, chap. III.1.1.

<sup>162</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,69–70: CSEL 85/1, 77 ff.

<sup>163</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,41: CSEL 85/2, 42. See also *Contra Iul. imp.* II,122: CSEL 85/1, 253; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,38: CSEL 85/2, 39 f.

<sup>164</sup> *Placetne vobis, ut ponamus ibi castos et castas contra libidinem dimicantes, gravidas nauisantes, fastidiantes, pallentes, alias in abortu puerperia immatura fundentes, alias in partu gementes et ululantes natosque ipsos omnes flentes, sero ridentes, serius loquentes et hoc balbutientes, in scholas postea duci, ut litteras discant, sub loris, ferulis virgisque plorantes, pro varietatibus ingeniorum distributa varietate poenarum, insuper innumerabiles morbos et daemonum incursum et ferarum morsus, quibus quidam cruciarentur, quidam et absumerentur; qui vero sani essent, sub incertis eorum casibus misera parentum sollicitudine nutrirentur; essent ibi etiam utique orbitates et luctus et amissorum carissimorum desideria cum doloribus cordis. Longum est persequi omnia, quibus malis abundat haec vita, nec sunt tamen ista ulla peccata. Haec ergo si futura erant in paradiso nullo ibi, cuius merito existerent, praecedente peccato, quaerite, ista quibus non plane fidelibus, sed irrisoribus praedicetis. Certe, si talis paradisus pingereetur, nullus diceret esse paradisum, nec si supra legisset hoc nomen inscriptum, nec diceret errasse pictorem, sed plane agnosceret irrisorem. Verum tamen eorum qui vos noverunt nemo miraretur, si adderetur ad titulum nomen vestrum et scriberetur paradisus Pelagianorum* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,154: CSEL 85/1, 459 f.). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* III,187: CSEL 85/1, 489; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,147: CSEL 85/1, 453; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,114: CSEL 85/2, 124; *Contra Iul. imp.* V,23:

culminating in physical death cannot originate in God's good creation, but in its corruption as a result of human guilt;<sup>165</sup> nor can it be human nature proper, but a nature vitiated by the human will (*vitiata natura*),<sup>166</sup> i.e., evil (*mala*) in this respect,<sup>167</sup> rendering all men "by nature children of wrath" (*natura filii irae*; cf. Eph. 2:3).<sup>168</sup>

Augustine holds that it was the first men themselves who inflicted the misery on the whole human race as a punishment for their transgression. Their children were already present in them in the seed (*ratione seminum*) at the time of their failure, and thus bear the guilt and the punishment of the first transgression as well: "For in that way all were present by reason of the seed in the loins of Adam when he was condemned, and he was, therefore, not condemned without them."<sup>169</sup> This guilt is transmitted henceforward by procreation, inevitably connected with enslaving concupiscence as a punishment, i.e., with the "shameful sexual desire" (*pudenda libido*):

For if shameful sexual desire had not either arisen from sin or been damaged by sin, it would not be shameful. Either it would not exist at all, and without it the sexual organs would obey the couple begetting a child, just as the hands obey workers, or it would follow upon the will so that it could never tempt anyone who is unwilling. ... There you see the source from which original sin is contracted.<sup>170</sup>

---

CSEL 85/2, 211; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,16: CSEL 85/2, 345. According to Julian, pain, to a certain extent, is part of human nature, and as such may be regarded as good (see J. Lössl, "Julian of Aeclanum on Pain", in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 10, 2002, 203–243).

<sup>165</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,3: CSEL 85/1, 7; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,25: CSEL 85/1, 22; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,50: CSEL 85/1, 44; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,67: CSEL 85/1, 72.

<sup>166</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,63: CSEL 85/1, 59 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,72: CSEL 85/1, 85; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,22: CSEL 85/1, 177; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,102: CSEL 85/1, 424; *Contra Iul. imp.* V,21: CSEL 85/2, 206.

<sup>167</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,188–190: CSEL 85/1, 492 f.

<sup>168</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,228: CSEL 85/1, 343 f.

<sup>169</sup> *Sic enim fuerunt omnes ratione seminis in lumbis Adam, quando damnatus est, et ideo sine illis damnatus non est* (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,12: CSEL 85/2, 183). English translation by R.J. Teske, 525. See also *Contra Iul. imp.* II,177: CSEL 85/1, 296 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,7: CSEL 85/1, 167 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,4: CSEL 85/1, 353. Augustine insists that all men were included in Adam at the moment of his transgression, although he is not able to explain whether their souls are derived from Adam's soul (*Contra Iul. imp.* II,178: CSEL 85/1, 299; see above, chap. III.2.1). Nevertheless, in one passage he implies that the souls of the father and son used to be one soul (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,38: CSEL 85/1, 380).

<sup>170</sup> *Pudenda enim libido nisi aut peccato exorta aut peccato vitiata esset, pudenda non esset et aut nulla esset omnino, et sine illa ita servirent genitalia membra gignentibus, ut manus serviunt operantibus, aut ita esset subsequens voluntatem, ut numquam posset sollicitare nolentem ... Ecce de qua trahitur originale peccatum ...* (*Contra Iul. imp.* II,42: CSEL 85/1, 193). English translation by R.J. Teske, 181.



Sin, transmitted in the human race, is thus both “alien” and our own: “They are sins of others, but they are the sins of our parents, and for this reason they are ours by the law of propagation and growth.”<sup>171</sup> Where the punishment is transmitted in the form of misery, guilt must be transmitted as well—otherwise God would be unjust.<sup>172</sup> If children were born guiltless, it would be unjust to expose them to so much bodily and mental suffering as we may notice in newborn infants.<sup>173</sup> Consequently, if there were no original sin, God would be either unjust or powerless, or would not care for human affairs at all, says Augustine.<sup>174</sup>

It is true that evil originates in the will, but in Adam’s race it has not only a character of one’s own active transgression, but also a punishment suffered for the transgression of the parents (*poena peccati*), which in itself is sin.<sup>175</sup> Sin is thus related to the will and does not exist without it; however, it need not always be a voluntary act, but also an independent product of the will (just as a coal does not exist without a fire, even though it need not always be in it).<sup>176</sup> Sin, desired as a voluntary act, may also be unwanted in terms of its consequence, i.e., guilt (*qui volens fecit peccatum, nolens habet peccatum*).<sup>177</sup>

Nothing, out of which men come, is not an active agent of evil, which Augustine is supposed to maintain according to Julian, but it accounts for the fact that the will is so fragile that it even turned away from the good: man is not God, whose free will cannot turn to evil, but only God’s

<sup>171</sup> *Aliena sunt, sed paterna sunt, ac per hoc iure seminationis atque germinationis et nostra sunt* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,48: CSEL 85/1, 40,108). English translation by R.J. Teske, 76. See also *Contra Iul. imp.* III,25: CSEL 85/1, 366. In order to support the teaching on the inclusion of men in Adam and their participation in his transgression, Augustine refers to Ambrose, *Expos. Luc.* 7,234: CSEL 32/4, 387; see also Ambrose, *De parad.* 13,67: CSEL 32/1, 325 (see also above, chap. III.1.7, n. 225; III.3.1, n. 43). Julian criticises Augustine’s inconsistency, as he claims that all men were in Adam and sinned in him, but, on the other hand, he elaborates on the theory of the hereditary transmission of sin. Augustine replies that men were in Adam, but not as individuals (*secundum substantiam suam*), but “in the seed” (*secundum rationem seminis*), through which life is transmitted and which was corrupted in Adam (*Contra Iul. imp.* IV,104: CSEL 85/2, 108–111).

<sup>172</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,27: CSEL 85/2, 397–409; *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,36: CSEL 85/2, 440–442.

<sup>173</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,35: CSEL 85/1, 26; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,54: CSEL 85/1, 51.

<sup>174</sup> *Deus igitur tuus in tot et tantis malis, quae parvuli patiuntur, aut iustitiam aut omnipotentiam aut ipsam curam rerum humanarum est perditurus* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,49: CSEL 85/1, 42). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,120: CSEL 85/1, 136; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,136: CSEL 85/2, 163 f.

<sup>175</sup> ... *aliud esse peccatum, aliud poenam peccati, aliud utrumque, id est ita peccatum ut ipsum sit etiam poena peccati ... Tertium vero genus, ubi peccatum ipsum est et poena peccati, potest intellegi in eo qui dicit: Quod nolo malum, hoc ago* (Rom. 7:19) (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,47: CSEL 85/1, 34 f.). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,44: CSEL 85/1, 32.

<sup>176</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,91: CSEL 85/2, 96 f.

<sup>177</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,103: CSEL 85/2, 106.

creation coming out of nothing and therefore capable of abandoning the good with his will.<sup>178</sup> Moreover, Adam's children are afflicted with the punishment of concupiscence defying the will, the loss of true freedom (*libertas*) and enslavement by sin (*servi sunt peccati*).<sup>179</sup> According to Augustine, the punishment does not consist in concupiscence (*concupiscentia*, *cupiditas*) itself, but in its disobedience against the will: with men in paradise, concupiscence was subject to the will; as a result of the transgression of the will it was corrupted and became disobedient.<sup>180</sup>

By denying the precariousness of the condition of the human race, by not recognising evil as evil (*mala negando esse quae mala sunt*), and by praising it as good instead, the Pelagians prevent its recovery.<sup>181</sup>

Only the man Jesus was exempted from the enslaving condition; as Augustine explains by means of a number of curious details, he was not deprived of his procreative power, but, as a result of his birth from a virgin, was spared the concupiscence defying the will.<sup>182</sup> Undoubtedly, he was

<sup>178</sup> *Nec ideo tamen ex bono potuit oriri voluntas mala, quia bonum factum est a Deo bono, sed quia de nihilo factum est, non de Deo. ... cum ego non necessitatem tribuerim tali causae, sed possibilitatem mali, quia non dixi ideo esse ortum, sed ideo potuisse oriri ex bono malum ... possibilitatem mali dedi huic causae, non necessitatem. Rationalis quippe creatura cum primum facta est, ita facta est, ut si peccare nollet, nulla necessitate urgeretur ut vellet, aut etiam non volens, id est invita peccaret et non quod vellet faceret bonum, sed malum quod nollet hoc ageret, ubi iam non peccatum illud quod simpliciter peccatum dicitur, sed etiam poena peccati est. Verumtamen male aliquid velle vel mali aliquid etiam nolens facere omnino non posset, nisi de nihilo facta esset, id est si Dei natura esset* (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,38: CSEL 85/2, 235 f.). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* V,42: CSEL 85/2, 245. On Augustine's idea of creation from nothing and his polemic against the Manichaean notion of matter, see A.-I. Bouton-Touboulic, *L'ordre*, 50–79.

<sup>179</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,76: CSEL 85/1, 92; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,88: CSEL 85/1, 101 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,91: CSEL 85/1, 104.

<sup>180</sup> *Praecessit mala voluntas, qua serpenti subdolo crederetur, et secuta est mala concupiscentia, qua cibo inhiaretur illicito. Non itaque ibi qualiscumque cupiditas qualicumque reluctata est voluntati, sed ei potius depravatae depravata servivit. Ac per hoc quamvis iam utraque mala esset, tamen voluntas cupiditatem, non voluntatem cupiditas duxit; nec praecessit voluntatem nec restitit voluntati. Denique si ante peccati consummationem ab opere illicito averteretur voluntas, sine labore ullo cupiditas illicita sedaretur* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,71: CSEL 85/1, 82 f.).

<sup>181</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,41: CSEL 85/2, 464; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,22: CSEL 85/1, 19 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,24: CSEL 85/1, 21; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,236: CSEL 85/1, 349 f. That is why it does not seem quite convincing when G.R. Evans speaks of the “essential triviality” of evil “in comparison with the light and power of the Good” or of Augustine’s “supremely optimistic view of the problem of evil” in the anti-Pelagian controversy (see G.R. Evans, *Augustine on Evil*, Cambridge 1982, 149).

<sup>182</sup> Augustine rejects Julian's accusation that he declares Christ to be a “natural eunuch” (*eunuchum naturaliter*). In Augustine's opinion, Christ was set free from concupiscence, which cannot be controlled by the will; he did not need to struggle with it (see *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,52–54: CSEL 85/2, 56–60; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,57: CSEL 85/2, 63 f.). For the relationship

a real man; or, more precisely, it was he who was the only real man in the original sense, not the poor sons of Adam, deformed by guilt (which became hereditary henceforward), concupiscence, ignorance and mortality. The man Jesus did not deserve to become exceptional in any way, but became such through unfathomable grace. Thus he became an “example of grace” (*exemplum gratiae*), i.e., a paradigm of its being given freely.<sup>183</sup> As the “second man”<sup>184</sup> he encompasses the “seed” (*semen*) of the new human race, liberated from the parental curse and death as its punishment.<sup>185</sup> Men enter this new race through a new, spiritual birth, in which they die with Christ to sin<sup>186</sup> in order to become the sons of God.<sup>187</sup> Men opt for the new life with their own will, i.e., faith; and yet, it is a will “prepared” or “caused” by God<sup>188</sup> and given to those men only from the damned human race, whom God came to like *gratis*.<sup>189</sup> Augustine makes it clear that God works a good will (*operatur*) in men so that it comes (*oriatur*) from the willing men themselves.<sup>190</sup> God aids the chosen ones in their victorious struggle with concupiscence<sup>191</sup> by setting the choice of their will free with his grace.<sup>192</sup> He does not follow the human idea of righteousness (as Jesus’ parable of the workers in the vineyard shows; Matt. 20:1–16), but endows men even with what they did not deserve<sup>193</sup> (and could not have deserved anyway because their enslaved wills

---

between Christ’s sinlessness and his birth from a virgin, Augustine refers to Ambrose (*De Noe* 3,7b: CSEL 32/1, 417; *Expos. Luc.* 2,56: CSEL 32/4, 72) in order to face Julian’s accusation that it is a Manichaeian-traducianist fabrication (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,66: CSEL 85/1, 65).

<sup>183</sup> *Ac per hoc ea gratia fiunt iusti homines, qui renascuntur in Christo, qua gratia iustus homo natus est Christus. Sicut ergo exemplum est vitae, ut eum imitando iuste agamus, ita est etiam exemplum gratiae, ut in eum credendo inde nos fieri speremus iustos per ipsum, unde factus est ipse* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,140: CSEL 85/1, 157).

<sup>184</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,187: CSEL 85/1, 306; see also *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,22: CSEL 85/2, 371.

<sup>185</sup> The physical birth, which brings about the “contagion of death”, is to be rectified by a new birth from the Holy Spirit (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,51: CSEL 85/1, 391f.; see also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,109–110: CSEL 85/1, 129; *Contra Iul. imp.* II,216: CSEL 85/1, 327; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,135: CSEL 85/2, 162). It is only in this new birth, says Augustine, that nobody is punished for the sins of his parents, as foretold in Ezek. 18:1–20 (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,38: CSEL 85/1, 380f.) and Jer. 31:29–30 (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,84: CSEL 85/1, 408f.).

<sup>186</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,225: CSEL 85/1, 339f.

<sup>187</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,106: CSEL 85/1, 426.

<sup>188</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,163: CSEL 85/1, 469.

<sup>189</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,125: CSEL 85/2, 149; *Contra Iul. imp.* IV,131: CSEL 85/2, 158.

<sup>190</sup> *Et si operatur Deus in homine voluntatem bonam, id utique agit, ut oriatur ab illo bona voluntas, cuius est voluntas* (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,42: CSEL 85/2, 245).

<sup>191</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,226: CSEL 85/1, 341f.

<sup>192</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,79: CSEL 85/1, 94.

<sup>193</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,38: CSEL 85/1, 28; similarly also *Contra Iul. imp.* III,27: CSEL 85/1, 367.

are not capable of good<sup>194</sup>)—although it is also true that God does not precipitate men into misery unless they are guilty.<sup>195</sup> However, it is God alone who decides who will be abandoned in his deserved misery with a hardened heart and who will be saved *gratis*.<sup>196</sup> Men cannot change or influence God's will in any way. According to Augustine, it is unthinkable that the destinies of men should be determined by men themselves, not by God's predestination, because human will cannot change the will of almighty God:

Heaven forbid that a human being should block the intention of the omnipotent God who foreknows all things! Those people who suppose that the omnipotent God can will something and be unable to do it, if a weak human being stands in his way, do not think enough on so immense a topic, or they are unable to think it through.<sup>197</sup>

Apart from their different viewpoints on human nature, the two authors also differ in their notions of human freedom. Julian holds that the freedom of choice is a possibility of choosing good or evil, i.e., of avoiding or committing sin.<sup>198</sup> Such freedom is naturally inherent in men and cannot be lost as a result of sin:

We say that the sin of a human being does not change the state of nature, but the quality of the merit; that is, we say that there is in sinners the same nature of free choice by which they can stop sinning as was present in them that they could turn away from righteousness.<sup>199</sup>

<sup>194</sup> *Nemo est liber ad agendum bonum sine adiutorio Dei* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,110: CSEL 85/1, 432). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,79–80: CSEL 85/1, 94 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,98: CSEL 85/1, 116.

<sup>195</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,87: CSEL 85/1, 224.

<sup>196</sup> *Sed gratia liberat a totius massae damnatione quos liberat; quam vos negando estis haeretici. Quantum enim pertinet ad originis meritum, ex uno omnes in condemnationem* (cf. Rom. 5:16); *quantum autem ad gratiam, quae non secundum merita datur, quicumque ab ista condemnatione liberantur, dicuntur vasa misericordiae; qui vero non liberantur, ira Dei manet super eos veniens de iusto iudicio Dei, quod non ideo vituperabile, quia inscrutabile est* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,127: CSEL 85/1, 139 f.).

<sup>197</sup> *Absit, ut impediatur ab homine omnipotentis et cuncta praescientis intentio. Parum de re tanta cogitant vel ei excogitandae non sufficiunt, qui putant Deum omnipotentem aliquid velle et homine infirmo impediende non posse* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105 f.). English translation by R.J. Teske, 116.

<sup>198</sup> *In quo est hoc, inquam, arbitrium liberum ...? Sine dubio in eo, ut possibile sit homini voluntatem suam sine aliquo inevitabili naturalium coactu vel immittere in crimen vel a crimine cohibere* (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,109: CSEL 85/1, 429). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,100–101: CSEL 85/1, 118.

<sup>199</sup> *Nos dicimus peccato hominis non naturae statum mutari, sed meriti qualitatem, id est et in peccante hanc esse liberi arbitrii naturam, per quam potest a peccato desinere, quae fuit ideo, ut posset a iustitia deviare* (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,96: CSEL 85/1, 111). English translation by R.J. Teske, 119.

Nor is their freedom bestowed on men through baptism or as a special grace of God.<sup>200</sup> Men cannot *not* be free (*non potest non esse liber*); this is not a matter of their will, but of their nature.<sup>201</sup> In this respect, there is not a transition between the will and human nature: the will cannot change human nature. That is why free will (*liberum arbitrium*) does not enslave itself, as this would be a contradiction in terms: being free (*liberum*) and captive (*captivum*) are opposites that exclude each other (*contraria*),<sup>202</sup> and the freedom of choice only exists as long as it is not subject to any necessity.<sup>203</sup> The will is a “motion of the mind, with nothing forcing it” (*motus animi cogente nullo*) and originating (*origo*) in nothing else.<sup>204</sup> The freedom of choice is respected by God under all circumstances, and it is thus men who determine their own destinies.<sup>205</sup>

On the contrary, Augustine maintains that the freedom of choice has the paradoxical quality of being able to cancel itself: in their first and only truly free choice, men lost their free choice of the good henceforward<sup>206</sup> (instead of excluding the possibility of evil). Their will is now enslaved by concupiscence (*voluntas captiva*<sup>207</sup>) as their own desires which do not obey their will and lead it astray. Concupiscence, i.e., “sin that dwells in me” (Rom. 7:17.20), is inherent in them (*suum esse*); each man is enslaved by himself—his sin is not committed by someone else.<sup>208</sup> The freedom of choice has thus become subject to the necessity (*necessitas*) to sin, i.e., slavery (*servitus*),

<sup>200</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,95: CSEL 85/1, 110; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,101: CSEL 85/1, 118.

<sup>201</sup> ... quod liberum arbitrium aliter constare non poterat quam ut haberet etiam peccandi possibilitatem. Libertatem ergo a necessario habet, voluntatem a possibili. Non potest non esse liber, sed in neutram voluntatem cogi potest factusque est rei necessariae possibilis effectus. In possibili ergo peccari potest, in necessario non potest, quia necessario non actor, sed auctor ipse censetur, atque hoc quod potest homo ex integro Dei est, a possibili autem ipse actor expenditur (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,47: CSEL 85/2, 253). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* VI,11: CSEL 85/2, 313f.

<sup>202</sup> ... nomen libertati captivitatis negatione tribuendum, ut, quoniam id, quod liberum non erat, alteri de contrariis cogeretur adhaerere, illud adversum ei id est liberum neutro sineretur addici (*Contra Iul. imp.* III,120: CSEL 85/1, 438).

<sup>203</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,122: CSEL 85/1, 439.

<sup>204</sup> ... voluntas enim motus est animi cogente nullo. Naturalia cuncta cogunt esse quod sequitur, voluntas autem, si praecedentibus causis cogatur, voluntas esse mox desinit et perdit conditionem, si accepit originem (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,41: CSEL 85/2, 242).

<sup>205</sup> ... nam cum alii [vasa] in honorem, alii in contumeliam fieri dicuntur (cf. Rom. 9:21), iuvatur sensus catholicorum, quo secundum diversitatem voluntatis humanae diversus etiam vasorum exitus praedicatur (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,126: CSEL 85/1, 138f.). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105.

<sup>206</sup> ... poena peccandi, qua periit libertas non peccandi (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,104: CSEL 85/1, 121).

<sup>207</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* III,112: CSEL 85/1, 433.

<sup>208</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* II,15: CSEL 85/1, 172.

because men no longer do what they will;<sup>209</sup> instead, they are “forced to be evil” (*mali esse coguntur*).<sup>210</sup> Their punishment consists in the very fact that they “sin against their will” (*peccat invitus*).<sup>211</sup> It is only grace which can restore the freedom of choice (i.e., it can endow men with a love of the law, stronger than concupiscence), and it is accepted by men solely through a gift of God as long as their will was predisposed to this acceptance by God.<sup>212</sup> It follows that human freedom is entirely subject to God’s will; the liberation or enslavement of men is not in their own hands; nor can they influence the judgement of God with their wills or acts, as these only fulfil the will of God.<sup>213</sup>

\*\*\*

Above all, the polemic against Julian of Eclanum made Augustine differentiate his theology from Manichaeism, to which it had become dangerously close in some points. Like the Manichaeans—who were also inspired by the teaching of the apostle Paul to a large extent—Augustine says that human nature, which is originally good, is accompanied by evil, located in the “flesh”; it enslaves men by defying their will and leading it astray. Concentrating mainly in libidinous sexuality, this evil is transmitted by procreation, which is then shrouded in shame. Unlike the Manichaeans, however, Augustine does not regard evil as a separate nature, but as a corruption or weakness of the good nature of humans, one which came out of the human will. Augustine maintains—which seems to be the main difference between his and Julian’s theological conceptions—that the will may corrupt man’s good nature; in other words, it may bring on its hereditary disease and enslavement.

<sup>209</sup> ... responde utrum necessitatem non habeat agendi malum, qui non quod vult facit bonum, sed non quod vult malum hoc agit (cf. Rom. 7:19) (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,50: CSEL 85/2, 255 f.). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,99: CSEL 85/1, 117; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,106: CSEL 85/1, 124.

<sup>210</sup> ... ibi naturae vitio de peccato primi hominis veniente iam mali sunt, non Dei creatione, qui nec velle possunt, mali esse coguntur (*Contra Iul. imp.* V,64: CSEL 85/2, 291).

<sup>211</sup> Est omnino sine voluntate peccatum, id est manet. Non enim maneret, nisi esset utique quod maneret, sed ut esset quod maneret sine voluntate, non est factum nisi voluntate, si tamen peccatum tantummodo peccatum sit, non etiam poena; hac enim quisque peccat invitus. Sic ergo utrumque verum est, et esse non posse sine voluntate peccatum, et esse posse sine voluntate peccatum ... (*Contra Iul. imp.* IV,100: CSEL 85/2, 103).

<sup>212</sup> *Contra Iul. imp.* I,94–95: CSEL 85/1, 109 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* I,101: CSEL 85/1, 119; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,109: CSEL 85/1, 429 f.; *Contra Iul. imp.* III,122: CSEL 85/1, 439 f.

<sup>213</sup> ... ut Deo sine meritis eorum faciente, ut faciant praecepta eius, incipiant merita bonorum habere factorum. Haec est gratia quam negatis, non ex operibus quae fiunt, sed ut fiant (*Contra Iul. imp.* I,134: CSEL 85/1, 150). Non ergo ex corde, hoc est ex voluntate oboedissent, si non praepararetur voluntas a domino (*Contra Iul. imp.* II,230: CSEL 85/1, 345). See also *Contra Iul. imp.* I,141: CSEL 85/1, 159 ff.

Against Julian's image of man as a naturally mortal being, who through his freedom (which, in accordance with God's intention, he cannot *not* have) becomes a "vessel of honour" or "dishonour", Augustine puts the Pauline notion of a man fallen into sin and death as its consequence, punished by the enslavement of his will, whose good action is dependent entirely on the help of God. While Julian considers the human condition as we experience it now to be human good nature itself in the way it was intended by God, Augustine is strongly disinclined to regard the misery and horror of human lives as God's intention, perceiving them instead as a punishment for human guilt: if it were not for the guilt inherited by the human race, says Augustine, the God permitting such misery would be unjust or powerless.

According to Julian, grace (the manifestation of the goodness of God) was involved in the very creation of man out of nothing, in the gift of rationality and freedom, and in the goodness of the law aimed at the orientation of man; but above all, in the incarnation of the Son of God, who, by coming through the human condition, made it possible for men to imitate him and become the sons of God as well, i.e., to transcend human nature with the help of God.

Augustine, on the contrary, regards grace as a recovery of corrupted human nature, especially the recovery of the split of the will, which may only fully turn towards the good when aided by God. Those elected from the condemned human mass are, says Augustine, endowed with the gift of the will, i.e., love, which is stronger than the enslaving concupiscence and helps men not to find delight in what contradicts the will. The recovery is a slow one because the consequences of the hereditary disease still remain in men, and it may only be brought to perfection in blissful eternity, not in the mortal body. Augustine's notion of man, unlike that of Julian, emphasises the ambivalence of the human condition: human nature is good, but became corrupted through the will; it is set free from slavery by grace, but in liberation one does not attain rest, but must struggle incessantly with oneself, i.e., against concupiscence as the disease of one's own nature. It is God who decides about victory or defeat; he may change the unpropitious condition of men only by pouring grace into their will, through which men find more delight in what is good than in its opposite, into which they are tempted by concupiscence, unrootable by knowledge.

## CONCLUSION

Augustine's and Julian's theologies of grace represent two quite different if not contrary conceptions of Christianity, which, in my opinion, are both to some extent justified despite being somewhat one-sided. On their own, they seem not to do justice to the human condition or the purpose of the Christian message; instead, they do so alongside each other and in their controversy.

Augustine's "understanding of grace" (*intellectus gratiae*), expressed for the first time in his answer to Simplicianus, certainly has a spiritual core which does not lack weight. All that is really valuable, including the will to goodness and the will to believe, was given to men without their possessing any previous merits; in this respect it only belongs to them as an accepted gift.<sup>1</sup> The only adequate reaction to the awareness of the fact that everything was given to us *gratis*, says Augustine, is to love *gratis* as well, for the sake of the love itself, not for the sake of something else; in other words, to love the donor himself, not his gifts.<sup>2</sup>

This doctrine is theologically grounded in the notion of a creator who did not create the world out of necessity, but out of unconditioned freedom owing nothing to anyone (i.e., "freely", *gratis*); and it is also freely, not on the grounds of human good will, but *gratis*, that he sets men who have strayed free from their culpable misery, bringing them to an even greater state of perfection than the one they lost. The divine offer comes in the incarnation of the Son of God, in whom—as he is a man defying the inherited misery of men—the new race of the sons of God was established.<sup>3</sup> One may become a member of this race through baptism (if there is an opportunity to accept it)<sup>4</sup> and especially through the gift of love, which the Holy Spirit pours out into the hearts of men in order to give them back their lost orientation towards the good.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; II.3.6; III.2.8.

<sup>2</sup> See above, chap. I.3.2; II.3.2; III.2.3.

<sup>3</sup> See above, chap. I.2.6; I.3.2; I.3.3d; II.3.1.b; III.2.2; III.2.3; III.2.5c; III.2.9; III.2.10b.

<sup>4</sup> See above, chap. II.4.2.

<sup>5</sup> See above, chap. I.2.3; III.1.2; III.2.3; III.2.5b.



In my opinion, however, it is wrong to conclude that the will of God, which makes possible and supports the orientation of men towards goodness and their will to believe, is a supreme cause, the efficaciousness of which is guaranteed by itself, and thus it cannot depend on men.<sup>6</sup> For, as Augustine puts it in one of his sermons: "God, who made you without you, doesn't justify you without you. So he made you without your knowing it, but he justifies you with your willing consent to it."<sup>7</sup> And yet, in the vein of his *Retractationes*, he would have to add: "and yet, even this will is prepared by God".<sup>8</sup> According to Augustine, the human will is indispensable for the salvation of men, but even the will is bestowed on them, and it is God alone who decides who he will endow with it.

This idea seems to have been motivated by his need to forestall the spiritual pride of men (if faith as the accepting of God's aid depended on men, they might regard it as their "merit") on one hand,<sup>9</sup> and his polemic against the Manichaeans on the other, whose God, fragmented in the particles of light imprisoned in the hostile darkness of matter, in fact depends on men, says Augustine, as long as their effort can set God free from captivity.<sup>10</sup>

Augustine's conviction that the fulfilment of the will of God, including the will concerning human salvation, cannot depend on men, however, makes him fall into the unfortunate trap of double predestination and inherited guilt. God, who bestows the will on which human salvation depends<sup>11</sup> (i.e., the will in the sense of actual wanting, not just a natural disposition), must in fact decide about the salvation of individual men on his own, either by saving all men universally (this solution is rejected by Augustine as Origen's fallacy<sup>12</sup>), or by a rationally unfathomable division of human beings into two groups predestined for salvation and condemnation. Such a division reflects neither good or failed human lives nor human faith or unfaithfulness, but is a sovereign, unsearchable act of the divine will.<sup>13</sup> If this is not to be an unjust act of despotism, it must be complemented by Augustine's doctrine on humankind as a rightfully condemned "mass of sinners"<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.2.10a–b; III.3.4.

<sup>7</sup> *Qui ergo fecit te sine te, non justificat sine te. Ergo fecit nescientem, justificat volentem* (*Serm.* 169,11,13; *PL* 38, 923). English translation after E. Hill, 231.

<sup>8</sup> See above, chap. III.2.8.

<sup>9</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; II.3.5.

<sup>10</sup> See above, chap. II.3.1d.

<sup>11</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.2.7; III.2.8; III.2.10a–b.

<sup>12</sup> See above, chap. III.2.9.

<sup>13</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.1.7; III.2.6; III.2.10a–b.

<sup>14</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.1.7.

and inherited human guilt as a personal guilt deserving a just punishment which afflicts all men from the very moment they are born (or, to be more precise, even before that).<sup>15</sup> In order to account for the hereditary contagion transmitted in the whole human race, Augustine employs a bizarre framework concerning guilt transmitted in procreation which defies the will; its libidinous character is a punishment for the mythical transgression of the first man,<sup>16</sup> which also brought on physical death.<sup>17</sup>

In this universe, man, for his part, cannot but fail in his actions. In order to do good, he must be aided by grace, which he cannot deserve, and nor can he influence its intervention. Without the far-from-guaranteed grace of God he cannot help entangling himself in his pride and desire.<sup>18</sup> And yet, he is responsible for these failures and is justly condemned for them. Moreover, he is justly condemned for his very birth from Adam's race, afflicted with its hereditary contagion.<sup>19</sup>

The God of this universe is an autocrat who influences the will of the chosen ones (but definitely not all men) by inspiring them with an affective "delight" in goodness.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, despite being perfectly simple, he passes a double judgement "before the world was created"<sup>21</sup> concerning two demonstration groups of men, "vessels of honour", through whom his freely given grace will manifest itself, and "vessels of dishonour", who will serve as a reminder of where the efforts of men lead if they are, as beings pervaded with nothingness, pride and desire, left without the help of God.<sup>22</sup>

For that reason, Julian's firm conviction that these notions are unsustainable and blasphemous seems quite justified. The bishop of Eclanum confronts them with his faith in an undivided good creator of the good nature of men, who, through the incarnation of God himself, are to become the sons of God. Julian does not have any doubts that the salvation of men is entrusted into the hands of men themselves and that it is not determined by God as an autocratic tyrant; instead, God makes his undivided will to save all men dependent on theirs. Men are thus beings of inalienable freedom, which may be used to the wrong end, but cannot be lost as a result of one's

<sup>15</sup> See above, chap. II.3.4; III.1.1; III.1.7; III.2.1.

<sup>16</sup> See above, chap. II.3.4; III.1.1; III.1.7; III.3.1–3.

<sup>17</sup> See above, chap. III.1.1.

<sup>18</sup> See above, chap. III.1.3; III.2.6; III.2.8.

<sup>19</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.3.3.

<sup>20</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; III.1.2; III.1.6; III.2.3; III.2.6; III.2.7.

<sup>21</sup> See above, chap. II.2.5; II.3.4.

<sup>22</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; II.2.5; III.2.8.

own unreasonable actions or, for that matter, because of the guilt of one's ancestors. By nature, man is a finite being, limited by his birth and perishing, and sexuality and death belong to him naturally. Even in his finiteness, however, he is a being of reason and freedom, who may, however deep he has fallen, always turn towards reason again and, aided by the law of God, the story of Christ and eschatological promises, confirm his fundamental orientation towards the good with his will.<sup>23</sup>

This apparently reasonable, optimistic and "humanistic" attitude, undoubtedly inspired by Julian's classical education, comes close in some respects to that of the early Augustine. And yet, Augustine is not satisfied with it; he even feels the need to reject it with the utmost resolution. The course of his rejection was traced in the previous chapters, together with its possible inspirations. In my opinion, Augustine was influenced by his reading of the Pauline letters (especially Romans 7 and 9)<sup>24</sup> and his aim of interpreting Paul's theology in an anti-Manichaean way<sup>25</sup> (this aim may also account for the certain affinity of his solution with Manichaeism:<sup>26</sup> it was as early as in his youth that Augustine accepted Manichaean questions, although he tried to answer them in an anti-Manichaean manner throughout his whole mature life). What must also have played a role was Augustine's reflection on the will, inspired to some extent by his own experience (mainly probably by his resolution of sexual abstinence, adopted with great difficulty and kept with an even greater effort).<sup>27</sup>

As for the image of God as a dualistic autocrat who influences the will of a narrow group of his chosen ones through a "sweetness" of love poured into them while leaving the others on purpose to their desires originating in the essential nothingness of created beings and in the mythical original guilt of the first man, I regard it as unsustainable and deserving of rejection in all its parts (it was never accepted as a whole by Christian theology anyway). Julian's God, who makes the efficaciousness of his will dependent on men, seems to do much more justice to the biblical message, and especially that of the New Testament.

Whether Julian's optimistic anthropology can also depict the human condition in all its difficulties and its plight is another question. I personally believe that (unfortunately) it cannot. This does not mean, however, that we

---

<sup>23</sup> See above, chap. III.3.2–4.

<sup>24</sup> See above, chap. I.3.3; II.3.3; III.2.8.

<sup>25</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1.

<sup>26</sup> See above, chap. III.3.1–4.

<sup>27</sup> See above, chap. II.2.4; II.3.5.

should or could accept Augustine's anthropological conclusions as a whole. Let us therefore conclude by discussing his voluntaristic notion of man and trying to grasp its actual benefits and fallacies.

The emphasis on the wills of God and man had been present as one of the key moments in Augustine's thinking from his earliest works. God did not create the world from necessity or incidentally or in a cruel cosmogonic struggle, but with a kind of ease, with a mere word (which is himself): he created it "because he willed".<sup>28</sup> The principle of the creator's freedom goes on to assert itself in Augustine's works against his early notion of the world order with immutable laws which God merely guarantees in their validity.<sup>29</sup>

To the principle of God's will and freedom corresponds the same principle in the constitution of men as beings who are to attain perfection with their will, through an act of their free choice.<sup>30</sup> Unlike the will of God, perfectly self-sufficient and always directed towards the good, the created will has an element of nothingness working in it from which all men come; this element works in the will, bringing on its ontological deficiency, dependency and reliance on the divine principle.<sup>31</sup> Unless the created will acknowledges the reliance and consents to it voluntarily (it is not clear whether in Augustine's opinion this is possible at all without the active aid of the creator<sup>32</sup>) it becomes its curse as it opens up a gap between one's own will and the will of the creator: its dependency will turn into an enslavement of the self by unattainable desires and the whole universe will defy the order wanted by the will of God and become subject to "futility".<sup>33</sup> Such are the mythological-ontological conditions of the historical situation of men, according to Augustine.

The situation itself is mainly marked by deep ambivalence because, as Augustine holds, it is not only a result of the will of the good creator, which established human nature as good, but also of the unpropitious human will, which turned away from its fundamental orientation and thus caused serious harm to the original human nature.<sup>34</sup> The "blow", which in his early works was not so prominent, gradually goes on to gain more importance, transforming both the theology of the African thinker and his concept of the will.

---

<sup>28</sup> See above, chap. I.2.4.

<sup>29</sup> See above, chap. I.1.2.

<sup>30</sup> See above, chap. I.2.2; III.2.5b.

<sup>31</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1; III.2.9; III.3.4.

<sup>32</sup> See above, chap. III.2.8; III.2.9.

<sup>33</sup> See above, chap. I.2.4; I.2.6; III.2.7; III.2.9.

<sup>34</sup> See above, chap. I.2.4; I.2.6; I.3.1; III.1.3; III.1.4.

One can already find in the works preceding Augustine's consecration as a priest a notion (inspired by Cicero) of free choice (*liberum arbitrium*) or the will (*voluntas*) which makes men responsible for their actions; these are spontaneous to the effect that they are not merely the results of efficient determination.<sup>35</sup> Men can (in the area which is "within their power") give their consent or dissent to the images of fantasy (*visa*) which emerge in the mind<sup>36</sup> or to the aims of their reason or senses,<sup>37</sup> and thus decide about their actions. Above all, they can decide whether they will succumb to the urge of their desires (*cupiditas*, *libido*) and seek temporary goals, which they may also lose involuntarily, or whether they will follow the advice of reason (*ratio*) and turn towards eternal things, which they cannot lose against their will and through which they will attain real happiness.<sup>38</sup> Repeated decisions create a "habit" (*consuetudo*) as a sediment of the will through which the will itself conditions its further decisions.<sup>39</sup> When clinging to ephemeral things, the habit may tie the will to such an extent that it cannot overcome its dominance. In fact, the habit may deprive the will of its freedom; or rather, it brings on a split in the will: the will, enslaved by the habit, becomes subject to desires, although it might want to seek a different goal. Such is Augustine's first exposition of the apostle's exclamation: "I do what I will not to do" (Rom. 7:20).<sup>40</sup>

The image of the voluntary self-enslavement of men, however, gradually becomes transformed alongside Augustine's elaboration on the notion of original sin. The split of the will is no longer a mere consequence of the previous unpropitious choices of the individual will, but a transmitted burden of the whole race, not chosen by individual men themselves. In the works preceding Augustine's consecration as bishop it is man who chooses how he will deal with the burden: whether he will deepen the inauspicious inherited situation or whether he will make an attempt at transforming it radically by opting for faith in the help of God. This option, i.e., the act of the free choice of the will as a decision in favour of faith, is an inalienable act of human freedom (*quod credimus, nostrum est*):<sup>41</sup> it is free consent to the divine offer, an acceptance of the help of God which mainly manifests itself as love working

---

<sup>35</sup> See above, chap. I.2.1; I.2.2; I.2.5.

<sup>36</sup> See above, chap. I.2.5.

<sup>37</sup> See above, chap. I.2.4.

<sup>38</sup> See above, chap. I.2.2.

<sup>39</sup> See above, chap. I.2.5; I.3.1; I.3.3b; II.1.1.

<sup>40</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1.

<sup>41</sup> See above, chap. I.3.3a.

in the hearts of men. According to this notion, faith is a human act, a human “merit” (*meritum*), while the acts of love are divine gifts.<sup>42</sup> The role of men is limited here to a kind of consent of one’s faith in the sense of an acceptance of divine help.

In the answer to Simplicianus, Augustine does not abandon this notion, but goes on to ask how such consent is possible. It is surely a result of the free choice of the will, but such a choice must be given to men as well. God thus endows human beings not only with the will as a capacity of their nature which makes them different from animals (as the Pelagians have it as well), but also with an orientation of the will to the good and the consent to the will that has been given itself (but not even this consent is a reason for men to “boast”). Ordering external circumstances and bringing images of fantasy (*visa*) to the human mind, God inspires men with an inner desire to realise them, i.e., with love, in such a persuasive manner that he moves their wills to consent.<sup>43</sup> Men thus choose “freely” in the sense of making a decision (not acting mechanically); they even make their choice “with delight” or an “appetite” because they are moved in their actions by “sweetness”: *liber facit, qui libens facit*, as Augustine will go on to say.<sup>44</sup> According to the bishop of Hippo, the “delight” is even a prerequisite of “true freedom” (*Ibi sumus veraciter liberi, ubi non delectamur inviti*).<sup>45</sup> It is only if human beings do not need to overcome illicit desires but give their consent to such a delight as they are willing to admit to that their will is not divided, but unified, and thus “free”. However, men do not act “freely” in the sense of unconditionality; on the contrary, their decisions will always be conditioned, either by the inherited slavery of sin, or by the sweetness of grace that has been freely given.

As follows from Augustine’s account directed against the Pelagians, the inherited weakness of the will can never be overcome completely.<sup>46</sup> Men (and only those men who accepted the working of grace) perceive themselves as divided between the intention of the will (which is the mind itself, just as it is its own understanding and memory<sup>47</sup>) and the dormant profundity of desire, i.e., concupiscence; activated by various kinds of stimulation, concupiscence paralyses the will or hinders its intentions, forcing it to fulfil

<sup>42</sup> See above, chap. I.2.6; I.3.1; I.3.3; I.2.3; on love, see already chap. I.2.3.

<sup>43</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2.

<sup>44</sup> See above, chap. III.1.6.

<sup>45</sup> See above, chap. III.3.1.

<sup>46</sup> See above, chap. III.1.1; III.1.4; III.1.7; III.3.1.

<sup>47</sup> See above, chap. III.2.5a.

what concupiscence itself aims to do.<sup>48</sup> Given the fact that desire can only reach its goal through the will, the will is afflicted with a strange split:<sup>49</sup> it follows its intention inspired by grace, but, at the same time, it is inclined in a different direction by concupiscence. When concupiscence gains control over the will, the man-will can say: “I do what I will not to do” (Rom. 7:16.20).<sup>50</sup> In other words, the will—which does not do what it wills not—is doing something that defies it.<sup>51</sup> This description also—and even mainly—relates to the situation of men, whose will is being healed by grace, but in this earthly life (in the “body of death”) it will never recover entirely.

Concupiscence (or the “sin” slumbering in the “flesh”) cannot be rooted out in this life, even though the will strengthened by grace does not always give its consent to it. In any case, the will is subject to concupiscence to such an extent that it is not able to struggle with it on its own, or, in other words, it is bound to fail.<sup>52</sup> It can only be strengthened by means of what it has become accustomed to, i.e., by affective persuasion (not by rational arguments which it may be familiar with but which do not help). That is why God must use this device in his aid to the enslaved will; he must entice it with the “sweetness” of love and persuade it by making it find “delight” in goodness that is more attractive and stronger than the enticement of mistaken concupiscence.<sup>53</sup>

Augustine’s notion of grace as an affectively working love, however, is concerned not only with the precedence of emotion over reason or disposition over reflection, or with a necessary affective-voluntary motivation of knowledge and action. These motifs, as far as they are identified in his work, are grounded in Augustine’s concept of human beings created from nothing as a special combination of spiritual self-reflection<sup>54</sup> and a dark profundity of obscurity.<sup>55</sup> Man created from nothing is not just a transparency of his rationality, but also an infinity of potentialities which he is not fully in control of and which, on the contrary, threaten to gain control over him; for this reason grace is not a mere gift of the law, Christ’s example and promises appealing to the reason, but also an affective force, an “attraction” of pleasure or love.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>48</sup> See above, chap. I.2.4; I.2.5; III.2.7; III.3.1.

<sup>49</sup> See above, chap. II.2.3.

<sup>50</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1; III.1.4.

<sup>51</sup> See above, chap. II.2.3.

<sup>52</sup> See above, chap. III.1.3; III.3.3.

<sup>53</sup> See above, chap. II.1.2; II.2.3; III.1.2; III.1.6; III.2.3; III.2.7.

<sup>54</sup> See above, chap. III.2.5a.

<sup>55</sup> See above, chap. III.2.7; III.3.1.

<sup>56</sup> See above, chap. III.2.6; III.2.7.

The suggestibility of the will by non-rational means (by the “sweetness” of grace), present already in Augustine’s answer to Simplicianus, seems to be further developed in his polemic against the Donatists (as the impact on the will by coercion) and pushed into the extreme consequences in his conflict with the Pelagians.

In my opinion, the main error of Augustine’s theological anthropology does not consist in his conviction that men are born into an unpropitious situation, not brought about by their own actions and penetrated by difficulties of all kinds (on the contrary, this has great intuitive force).<sup>57</sup> What seems far less obvious is his anti-Manichaean statement drawing on his concept of theodicy that all human misery originates in the human will.<sup>58</sup> This notion, however, is revised by Augustine himself, because in fact it only applies to the mythical founder of the human race. All his descendants are afflicted with the consequences of his fatal transgression, sedimented into apparently involuntary miseries such as limitation, difficulty, pain, disease and death.<sup>59</sup> His statement that evil originates in the will is not a depiction of the historical situation of men, but a kind of ontologisation of the mythical story of the beginning of the human race. A more detailed analysis of the will brings Augustine to nothingness lying at the bottom of created beings as the true cause of their failure.<sup>60</sup> No historical man, according to Augustine, experiences the misery of his situation as a consequence of his own will, although it is true that every man heightens the misery with his will not only for himself, but (unfortunately) for others as well.

Finally, I regard as an entirely unacceptable notion Augustine’s conviction (inspired by his doctrine on grace) that the unchosen misery of the human condition has a guilty character for which all men deserve punishment from the moment they are born (or even before that). The perverse idea that punishable guilt may be hereditary and the medium of its transmission is libidinous procreation does not require special confutation, either.

---

<sup>57</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1; III.3.3–4.

<sup>58</sup> See above, chap. I.2.2; I.3.1.

<sup>59</sup> See above, chap. I.3.1; II.1.1; III.3.3–4.

<sup>60</sup> See above, chap. II.3.1; III.2.9; III.3.4.





## EPILOGUE

### AUGUSTINE AS A PHILOSOPHER OF THE WILL

As far as Augustine's doctrine on the will is concerned, it is sometimes regarded as a kind of novelty with respect to ancient thinking in all its facets;<sup>1</sup> however, in my opinion, all of Augustine's reflections on the will (not only selected parts) must be taken into consideration here.

If we perceive the will as a capacity from which consciously good or consciously evil deeds come and which in itself is not determined by anything else (in other words, if the will includes the essential conscious choice of one's orientation towards the good *or towards evil* and if it also includes an aspect of spontaneity not following from any determinations), then, to a large extent, the will is probably Augustine's invention.<sup>2</sup> Aristotle (regarded as the most likely candidate for the position of philosopher of the will,

---

<sup>1</sup> Augustine as the "first philosopher of the will" is presented e.g. by H. Arendt, who analyses the following: the split of the will conquered, according to Augustine, by love; the will as the actual attention of the spirit, which in Augustine's analysis of time transforms the future into the past; and, finally, the will as the place of the individual spontaneity of man, who in his "nativity" is always a new beginning (*initium*) (see H. Arendt, *The Life of the Mind*, II: *Willing*, New York 1978, 84–110). On the central role of the will and its integration into the very act of cognition, which distinguishes Augustine from his Graeco-Roman predecessors, see also G. O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind*, 6. Augustine's innovative approach is presented from a different perspective by A. Dihle, who emphasises the role of Roman legal science, dealing with the will as different from the intellect and emotions, in the creation of the notion *voluntas*, which Augustine was the first to apply in a theological and psychological analysis (see A. Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 1982, 123–144; for a further discussion on Dihle's "seminal study", see J. Müller,—R.H. Pich, "Auf dem Weg zum Willen? Eine problemgeschichtliche Hinführung zur Genese des philosophischen Willensbegriffs in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike", in: *idem*, eds., *Wille und Handlung*, 1–6). R. Sorabji ascribes to Augustine the originality of bringing together several motives which occurred separately in others: will, which belongs to the rational soul; will as connected with freedom; will as connected with responsibility; will-power and the failure of will-power; will as ubiquitous in all action; pride as the criterion of a perverted will (see R. Sorabji, "The Concept of the Will from Plato to Maximus the Confessor", in: T. Pink—M.W.F. Stone, *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, London 2004, 18–20). On the other hand, M. Frede represents Augustine's concept of the will as entirely dependent on the Stoic one (see M. Frede, *A Free Will: Origins of the Notion in Ancient Thought*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 2011, 153–174).

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Ch. Horn, "Augustinus und die Entstehung des philosophischen Willensbegriffs", in: *ZPhF* 50, 1996, 113–132.

especially because of his reflections in both *Ethics*),<sup>3</sup> did know βούλησις as a rational desire, but this is always directed towards the good and must always want the good or what is presumed to be good.<sup>4</sup> The human capacity of choice (προαίρεσις) connecting opinion (δόξα or judgment, διάνοια) and desire (ὄρεξις),<sup>5</sup> i.e., “a deliberate desire (βουλευτική ὄρεξις) of what lies in our power”,<sup>6</sup> makes a choice between the individual moves (good and evil ones) directed towards a certain goal, but does not involve the choice of the goal itself, the choice of the primary orientation.<sup>7</sup> Only those actions are “within man’s power” (ἐφ’ αὐτῷ) which would not have taken place without him, i.e., which originate in him<sup>8</sup> (including the choice of a good or a bad life, which, nevertheless, takes place as part of the unchosen aim of attaining happiness<sup>9</sup>). Finally, “voluntary” actions (τὸ ἐκούσιον) are spontaneous whether or not they are based on a choice.<sup>10</sup> However, these four themes of Aristotle’s anthropology, developed further by the Stoics,<sup>11</sup> are not connected in a coherent concept rendering the later Latin (medieval) *voluntas* in all its breadth.<sup>12</sup> And above all, this anthropology leaves no space for the unconditioned choice of the orientation of one’s life towards the good *or*

<sup>3</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,1–8, 1109b–1115a; *Eth. Eud.* II,6–11, 1222b–1228a. Cf. A. Kenny, *Aristotle’s Theory of Will*, London 1979. The contribution of Aristotle and the Stoics to the theory of the will is discussed by C.H. Kahn, who, nevertheless, does not find an elaborated concept of the will with them (see C.H. Kahn, “Discovering the Will. From Aristotle to Augustine”, in: J.M. Dillon—A.A. Long, *The Question of “Eclecticism”*, *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*, Berkeley—Los Angeles—London 1988, 234–259). For a similar conclusion concerning Plato and Aristotle, see Ch. Horn, “Augustinus”, 119–126.

<sup>4</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,6, 1131a14 ff.; *Eth. Eud.* II,7, 1223b7 f.; *Rhet.* I,10, 1369a2–4. At the same time, Aristotle occasionally mentions evil as the object of a wish (βούλησις ... τοῦ κακοῦ) in contravention of nature (see *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1227a28 ff.), which means being wrong in what is good (for more details, see A. Kenny, *Aristotle’s Theory of Will*, 78 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> See Aristotle, *De motu* 6, 700b23; *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1226b2 ff.; *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1227a3 f.

<sup>6</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,5, 1131a10 f.; *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1226b16 f.

<sup>7</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,5, 112b11 ff.; *Eth. Nic.* III,7, 113b3 ff.; *Eth. Nic.* VI,2, 1138b31–34; *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1226a7 ff.

<sup>8</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* II,6, 1223a4–9.

<sup>9</sup> See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,7, 113b3 ff.; *Eth. Eud.* II,6, 1223a9 ff.; see also *Eth. Nic.* I,3, 1095b19 ff.

<sup>10</sup> All the things that it rests with us to do or not to do and which do not follow from our ignorance are also done voluntarily (see Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* II,10, 1226b30 ff.). Deeds done from anger (θυμός) and desire (ἐπιθυμία) qualify as not based on choice, but still voluntary; similarly, also the deeds done by children and animals (see Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,3, 1112a24 ff.; *Eth. Nic.* III,4, 1112b6–10).

<sup>11</sup> See A.-J. Voelke, *L’idée de volonté*, 56–75. For Aristotle’s “choice without a will” and the Stoic invention not only of the notion of the will but also of free will, see M. Frede, *A Free Will*, 19–30, 31–48 and 67–88, respectively.

<sup>12</sup> C.H. Kahn, “Discovering the Will”, 239–241.

towards evil as it appears e.g. in Augustine's early work *De libero arbitrio*<sup>13</sup> or *De civitate Dei* (concerning the choice of angels through which these spiritual beings were divided, solely on the grounds of their will-love, into good and evil ones).<sup>14</sup> The will wanting *gratis malum*, evil for its own sake<sup>15</sup> (which is surely not a mere incontinence in the sense of Aristotle's ἀκρασία) seems to be Augustine's innovation.<sup>16</sup>

With a view to the whole of Augustine's work we should realise that the bishop of Hippo does not attribute this role of the will to men in their historical situation ("after the fall"). A human being is born with a capacity of choice (the passages in which Augustine denies the fallen man *liberum arbitrium* must be regarded as somewhat exaggerated<sup>17</sup>), but is

<sup>13</sup> See above, chap. I.2.2; I.3.1. A comparison between *De lib. arb.* I and Epictetus is drawn by R.H. Pich, "Προαίρεσις und Freiheit bei Epiktet: Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Geschichte des Willensbegriffs", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung*, 120–113.

<sup>14</sup> See above, chap. III.2.9. This notion of Augustine's is close to Origen's conception of the fall of spiritual beings which determined their ontological status (see Origen, *De princ.* II,9,2: SC 252, 354–356; for more details, see T. Kobusch, "Die philosophische Bedeutung des Kirchenvaters Origenes. Zur christlichen Kritik an der Einseitigkeit der griechischen Wesensphilosophie", in: *ThQ* 165, 1985, 94–105). Although Origen (in Rufinus' translation) says that the movement of these spiritual beings to the good should be voluntary (*volutarios et liberos motus, voluntate propria*), the opposite movement is caused by "negligence" or "satiation" (*neglegentia, taedium*), which is not a voluntary evil, but mere slackening (see M. Harl, "Recherches sur l'origénisme d'Origène: la satiété (κόρος) de la contemplation comme motif de la chute des âmes", in: *StPatr* 8, 1966, 373–405). Augustine seems to have connected Origen's notion with the Latin concept of the will (*voluntas*) as adopted by e.g. Seneca (A.-J. Voelke, *L'idée de volonté*, 161–190; 199 f.), while he placed fresh emphasis on the possibility of choosing evil voluntarily. On the difference between Origen's (Stoic) and Augustine's conception of the will, see M. Perkams, "Ethischer Intellektualismus und Willensbegriff. Handlungstheorie beim griechischen und lateinischen Origenes", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung*, 239–258.

<sup>15</sup> See above, chap. II.2.2.

<sup>16</sup> According to Aristotle, ἀκρασία are deeds in which men lose control over themselves despite knowing what is right (*Eth. Nic.* VII,8, 1150b19 ff.; *Eth. Eud.* II,8, 1224b8 ff.), or deliberately harmful deeds (*Rhet.* I,10, 1368b11 ff.)—where, however, it is not clear on what amount of actual knowledge the deed rests (*Eth. Eud.* II,9, 1225b11 ff.). Generally speaking, "a man of defective self-restraint (ὁ ἀκρατής) acts from desire (ἐπιθυμῶν) but not from choice (προαίρου-μενος)" (Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* III,4, 1111b13 f.). See A. Kenny, *Aristotle's Theory of Will*, 38–41, 56 f., 161–166; Ch. Horn, "Augustinus", 121–126; M. Frede, *A Free Will*, 22–24. On the Stoic explication of ἀκρασία, see J. Müller, "Doch mein Zorn ist Herrscher über meine Pläne"—Willensschwäche aus der Sicht der Stoiker, in: idem—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung*, 45–68. J.M. Rist suggests a possibility of explaining Augustine's divided will in terms of a radicalised ἀκρασία as well (see J.M. Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized*, Cambridge 1994, 184 f.). On the other hand, T.D.J. Chappell shows the difference between both authors (T.D.J. Chappell, *Aristotle and Augustine on Freedom: Two Theories of Freedom, Voluntary Action and Akrasia*, London—New York 1995).

<sup>17</sup> See above, chap. III.2.8 incl. n. 326.

also afflicted with the inherited burden of guilt and with a will weakened by concupiscence. Without the aid of God, he is actually only capable of evil (even if his will wants the good, it is too weak to carry it out and to persevere in its willingness, and abandons it voluntarily). Like Aristotle, Augustine maintains that men do not choose their primary orientation, but have it already: according to Augustine, however, this orientation is not directed towards the good, but is divided between wanting the good and the actual inability to perform it (it is “not able not to sin”). Only freely given grace accepted by the will that has been given from God can change the unpropitious situation, or rather, it may transform it gradually until the will that is unable to do good turns eschatologically into an entirely free will, one “not able to sin”.<sup>18</sup> The ability to accept the new orientation and persevere in it is not an unconditioned choice, but a freely given (i.e., conditioned) will (faith). Therefore, it is not true that the historical (“fallen”) man chooses his orientation or that his will, either evil or good, is unconditioned: in his evil will he is conditioned by original sin, while in his will to good he is endowed with the gift of grace. (Because of the ambiguity of Augustine’s account, I leave aside here the extent to which the will of the first man in paradise was actually conditioned by his origin in nothing and therefore could not have made any other choice than a wrong one.) Thus not even Augustine attributes the will as a conscious and unconditioned choice of orientation to the historical man.

With a certain amount of hyperbole one should rather say that the will which Augustine “invented” for the historical man differs from the ancient notion mainly in its split<sup>19</sup> (i.e., its fundamental direction towards the good, but, at the same time, also its innate orientation towards evil) and its absolute inner conditionality (by inherited sin or by grace) which, nevertheless, does not take away its responsibility for its own deeds. “Freedom”, according to Augustine, consists in the overcoming of the split of the will; it is a gift of an affective delight in what the will has accepted as good and the ability to carry out the will conditioned by the delight. What Augustine bequeaths to European thinking is not only the notion of man as a being defined by the self-reflection of understanding and the will,<sup>20</sup> but also the conviction that

<sup>18</sup> See above, chap. III.2.8 incl. n. 336; III.2.10a incl. n. 452.

<sup>19</sup> Phaedra’s split between passion and moral scruples (*hoc quod volo me nolle*, Seneca, *Phaedra*, 604f.), which reminds one of Rom. 7:14ff. (so J. Müller, “Doch mein Zorn ist Herrscher über meine Pläne”, 57), is not a split of will (see Th. Fuhrer, “Wollen oder Nicht(-)Wollen: Zum Willenskonzept bei Seneca”, in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung*, 79f.).

<sup>20</sup> See above, chap. III.2.5a.

in his historical condition man is a being with an enslaved will, inevitably succumbing to evil, who, nevertheless, is responsible for the evil and who can only be persuaded to good deeds by the “sweetness” of divine love. It is probably the ambivalence of this heritage which makes Augustine’s thinking forever disquieting and worth not only theological revision, but also philosophical reflection.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Works by Augustine* (and English Translations Quoted in This Book)

- Adnotationes in Iob* (= *Adnot. Iob*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28/3,3, Wien 1895.
- Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* (= *Brev. coll. Don.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 53, Wien 1910; reprinted in: *BA* 32 (*Traité anti-donatistes V*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes E. Lamirande, Paris 1965.
- Confessionum libri XIII* (= *Confess.*), ed. L. Verheijen, CCL 27, Turnhout 1981. English translation H. Chadwick, *Confessions*, Oxford 1991. English translation M. Boulding, *The Confessions* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/1), New York 1997.
- Contra Academicos* (= *Contra Acad.*), ed. W.M. Green, CCL 29, Turnhout 1970.
- Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* (= *Contra advers. leg. proph.*), ed. K.-D. Daur, CCL 49, Turnhout 1985.
- Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam libri quattuor* (= *Contra Cresc.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52, Wien 1909; reprinted in: *BA* 31 (*Traité anti-donatistes IV*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes A.C. de Veer, Paris 1968.
- Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* (= *Contra ep. Pel.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, CSEL 60, Wien 1913; reprinted in: *BA* 23 (*Premières polémiques contre Julien*), introduction, traduction et notes F.-J. Thonnard—E. Bleuzen—A.C. de Veer, Paris 1974. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians II: Answer to the Two Letters of the Pelagians* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/24), New York 1998.
- Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti* (= *Contra ep. fund.*), *BA* 17 (*Six traités anti-manichéens*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes R. Jolivet—M. Jourjon, Paris 1961.
- Contra epistulam Parmeniani libri tres* (= *Contra ep. Parm.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51, Wien 1908; reprinted in: *BA* 28 (*Traité anti-donatistes I*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes Y. Congar, Paris 1963.
- Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (= *Contra Faust.*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 25/1, Wien 1891.
- Contra Felicem Manichaeum* (= *Contra Fel.*), *BA* 17 (*Six traités anti-manichéens*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes R. Jolivet—M. Jourjon, Paris 1961.
- Contra Fortunatum Manichaeum, Acta seu disputatio*—(= *Contra Fort.*), *BA* 17 (*Six traités anti-manichéens*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes R. Jolivet—M. Jourjon, Paris 1961.
- Contra Iulianum* (= *Contra Iul.*), *NBA* 18/1 (*Polemica con Giuliano I*), testo latino dell'edizione Maurina, introduzione e note N. Cipriani, traduzione E. Cristini, Roma 1985. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians II: Answer to Julian* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/24), New York 1998.



- Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* (= *Contra Iul. imp.*), ed. M. Zelzer (post E. Kalinka), CSEL 85/1 (I–III), Wien 1974; CSEL 85/2 (IV–VI), Wien 2004. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians III: Unfinished Work in Answer to Julian* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. 1/25), New York 1999.
- Contra litteras Petiliani libri tres* (= *Contra litt. Petil.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52, Wien 1909; reprinted in: BA 30 (*Traité anti-donatistes III*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes B. Quinot, Paris 1967. English translation J.R. King, *In Answer to the Letters of Petilian, the Donatist* (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff), vol. 4, Ann Arbor 1974 (1887<sup>1</sup>).
- Contra Secundinum Manichaeum* (= *Contra Sec.*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 25/2, Wien 1892.
- Contra sermonem Arrianorum* (= *Contra ser. Arr.*), ed. M.J. Suda, CSEL 92, Wien 2000.
- De agone Christiano* (= *De ag. Christ.*), BA 1 (*La morale chrétienne*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes B. Roland-Gosselin, Paris 1949<sup>2</sup>.
- De anima et eius origine* (= *De an. et or.*) = *De natura et origine animae*, ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, CSEL 60, Wien 1913. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Nature and Origin of the Soul* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. 1/23), New York 1996.
- De baptismo libri septem* (= *De bapt.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51, Wien 1908; reprinted in: BA 29 (*Traité anti-donatistes II*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes G. Bavaud, Paris 1964. English translation J.R. King, *On Baptism, Against the Donatists* (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Ph. Schaff), vol. 4, Ann Arbor 1974 (1887<sup>1</sup>).
- De beata vita* (= *De beata vita*), ed. J. Doignon, BA 4/1 (*Dialogues philosophiques: La vie heureuse*), Paris 1986. English translation R. Allison Brown, *S. Aurelii Augustini De beata vita: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. 72), Washington, D.C., 1944.
- De bono coniugali* (= *De bono coniug.*), BA 2 (*Problèmes moraux*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes G. Combès, Paris 1948.
- De bono viduitatis* (= *De bono vid.*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 41, Wien 1900. English translation R. Kearney, *The Excellence of Widowhood* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. 1/9), New York 1999.
- De catechizandis rudibus* (= *De catech. rud.*), ed. I.B. Bauer, CCL 46, Turnhout 1969. English translation J.P. Christopher, *The First Catechetical Instruction* (Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten and J.C. Plumpe, vol. 2), New York 1946.
- De civitate Dei libri XXII* (= *De civ. Dei*), ed. B. Dombart—A. Kalb, CCL 47–48, Turnhout 1955. English translation M. Dods, *The City of God* (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Ph. Schaff, vol. 2), Ann Arbor 1973 (1886<sup>1</sup>).
- De consensu evangelistarum* (= *De cons. evang.*), ed. F. Weihrich, CSEL 43, Wien 1904.
- De correptione et gratia* (= *De corrept.*), ed. G. Folliet, CSEL 92, Wien 2000; BA 24 (*Aux moines d'Adrumète et de Provence*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Chéné—J. Pintard, Paris 1962. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians IV: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence: Rebuke and Grace* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. 1/26), New York 1999.

- De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* (= *Simpl.*), ed. A. Mutzenbecher, Turnhout 1970, CCL 44. English translation B. Ramsey, *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. R. Canning, vol. I/12), New York 2008.
- De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* (= *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*), ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCL 44A, Turnhout 1975.
- De doctrina Christiana libri quattuor* (= *De doctr. Christ.*), ed. I. Martin, CCL 32, Turnhout 1962.
- De dono perseverantiae* (= *De dono persev.*), BA 24 (*Aux moines d'Adrumète et de Provence*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Chéné—J. Pintard, Paris 1962. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians IV: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence: The Gift of Perseverance* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/26), New York 1999.
- De duabus animabus* (= *De duabus anim.*), BA 17 (*Six traités anti-manichéens*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes R. Jolivet—M. Jourjon, Paris 1961.
- De fide et symbolo* (= *De fide et symb.*), ed. J. Rivière, BA 9 (*Exposés généraux de la foi*), traduction et notes J. Rivière, Paris 1988<sup>2</sup>.
- De Genesi ad litteram libri XII* (= *De Gen. litt.*), BA 48–49, text ed. J. Zycha (CSEL 28/1, Wien 1894), introduction, traduction et notes P. Agaësse—A. Solignac, Paris 1972. English translation E. Hill, *On Genesis: The Literal Meaning of Genesis* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/13), New York 2002.
- De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* (= *De Gen. litt. imp.*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28/1, Wien 1894.
- De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (= *De Gen. Manich.*), ed. D. Weber, CSEL 91, Wien 1998. English translation E. Hill, *On Genesis: A Refutation of the Manichees* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/13), New York 2002.
- De gestis Pelagii* (= *De gest. Pel.*), ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 42, Wien—Prag—Leipzig 1902; reprinted in: BA 21 (= *La crise pélagienne I*), introductions, traductions et notes G. de Plinval—J. de La Tullaye, Paris 1966. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Deeds of Pelagius* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De gratia Christi et de peccato originali libri duo* (= *De grat. Chr. pecc. orig.*), ed. F. Vrba—J. Zycha, CSEL 42, Wien 1902; reprinted in: BA 22 (*La crise pélagienne II*), introduction, traductions et notes J. Plagnieux—F.-J. Thonnard, Paris 1975. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Grace of Christ and Original Sin* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De gratia et libero arbitrio* (= *De grat. lib. arb.*), BA 24 (*Aux moines d'Adrumète et de Provence*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Chéné—J. Pintard, Paris 1962. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians, IV: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence: Grace and Free Choice*

- (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/26), New York 1999.
- De gratia Novi Testamenti* (= *De grat. Novi Test.*) = *Ep.* 140, ed. A. Goldbacher, *CSEL* 44, Wien 1898. English translation W. Parsons, *Letters*, vol. III (131–164), (The Fathers of the Church, vol. 20), Washington, D.C., 1953.
- De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum liber unus* (= *De haer.*), ed. R. Vander Plaetse—C. Beukers, *CCL* 46, Turnhout 1969. English translation L.G. Müller, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine* (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. 90), Washington, D.C., 1956.
- De libero arbitrio libri tres* (= *De lib. arb.*), ed. W.M. Green, *CCL* 29, Turnhout 1970. English translation M. Pontifex, *The Problem of Free Choice* (Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten and J.C. Plumpe, 22), New York 1955. English translation R.P. Russell, *The Free Choice of the Will* (The Fathers of the Church, ed. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 59), Washington, D.C., 1968.
- De magistro liber unus* (= *De mag.*), ed. K.-D. Dauer, *CCL* 29, Turnhout 1970.
- De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum* (= *De mor. eccl.*), *CSEL* 90, ed. J.B. Bauer, Wien 1992. English translation D.A. Gallagher and I.J. Gallagher, *The Catholic and Manichaean Ways of Life* (The Fathers of the Church, ed. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 56), Washington, D.C., 1966.
- De musica libri sex* (= *De mus.*), *BA* 7 (*Dialogues philosophiques: La musique*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes G. Finaert—F.-J. Thonnard, Paris 1947.
- De natura boni* (= *De nat. boni*), ed. J. Zycha, *CSEL* 25/2, Wien 1892.
- De natura et gratia* (= *De nat. grat.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, *CSEL* 60, Wien 1913. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: Nature and Grace* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (= *De nupt.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, *CSEL* 42, Wien 1902; reprinted in: *BA* 23 (*Premières polémiques contre Julien*), introduction, traduction et notes F.-J. Thonnard—E. Bleuzen—A.C. de Veer, Paris 1974. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians II: Marriage and Desire* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/24), New York 1998.
- De opere monachorum* (= *De op. mon.*), *BA* 3 (*L'ascétisme chrétien*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Saint-Martin, Paris 1949<sup>2</sup>.
- De ordine libri duo* (= *De ord.*), ed. M. Green, *CCL* 29, Turnhout 1970. English translation R.P. Russell, *Divine Providence and the problem of evil* (The Fathers of the Church, ed. L. Schopp, vol. 5), New York 1948.
- De patientia* (= *De pat.*), ed. J. Zycha, *CSEL* 41, Wien 1900.
- De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* (= *De pecc. mer.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, *CSEL* 60, Wien 1913. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins and the Baptism of Little Ones* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (= *De perf. iust.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, *CSEL* 42, Wien—Prag—Leipzig 1902; reprinted in: *BA* 21 (*La crise pélagienne I*), introductions, traductions et notes G. de Plinval—J. de La Tullaye, Paris 1966. English

- translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Perfection of Human Righteousness* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De praedestinatione sanctorum* (= *De praed. sanct.*), BA 24 (*Aux moines d'Adrumète et de Provence*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Chéné—J. Pintard, Paris 1962. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians IV: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence: The Predestination of the Saints* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/26), New York 1999.
- De quantitate animae* (= *De quant. an.*), ed. W. Hörmann, CSEL 89, Wien 1986. English translation J.M. Collier, *The Greatness of the Soul* (Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten—J.C. Plumpe, vol. 9), New York 1950, 1978<sup>2</sup>.
- De sancta virginitate* (= *De sancta virg.*), BA 3 (*L'ascétisme chrétien*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introduction, traduction et notes J. Saint-Martin, Paris 1949<sup>2</sup>. English translation R. Kearney, *Holy Virginity* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/9), New York 1999.
- De sermone Domini in monte* (= *De serm. Dom.*), ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCL 35, Turnhout 1967. English translation J.J. Jepson, *The Lord's Sermon on the Mount* (Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten—J.C. Plumpe, vol. 5), New York 1948.
- De spiritu et littera* (= *De spir. et litt.*), ed. C.F. Vrba—J. Zycha, CSEL 60, Wien 1913. English translation R.J. Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians: The Spirit and the Letter* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/23), New York 1997.
- De Trinitate libri XV* (= *De Trin.*), ed. W.J. Mountain, CCL 50–50A, Turnhout 1968. English translation E. Hill, *The Trinity* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. I/5), New York 1991.
- De unico baptismo liber* (= *De unico bapt.*), ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 53, Wien 1910; reprinted in: BA 31 (*Traité anti-donatistes IV*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes A.C. de Veer, Paris 1968.
- De utilitate credendi* (= *De util. cred.*), BA 8 (*La foi chrétienne*), texte de l'édition bénédictine, introductions, traduction et notes J. Pegon, Paris 1951.
- De vera religione* (= *De vera relig.*), ed. K.-D. Daur, CCL 32, Turnhout 1962.
- Enarrationes in Psalmos* (= *Enarr. Psalm.*), ed. D.E. Dekkers—I. Fraipont, CCL 38–40, Turnhout 1956; ed. C. Weidmann, CSEL 93/1A, Wien 2003.
- Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate* (= *Enchir.*), ed. E. Evans, CCL 46, Turnhout 1969. English translation L.A. Arand, *Faith, Hope and Charity* (Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. Quasten—J.C. Plumpe, vol. 3), New York 1947.
- Epistula ad catholicos de secta Donatistarum* (= *Ep. cath.*) = *De unitate Ecclesiae*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 52, Wien 1909; reprinted in: BA 28 (*Traité anti-donatistes I*), traduction G. Finaert, introduction et notes Y. Congar, Paris 1963.
- Epistulae* (= *Ep.*), ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 34/1 (*Ep.* 1–30); CSEL 34/2 (*Ep.* 31–123); CSEL 44 (*Ep.* 124–184); CSEL 57 (*Ep.* 185–270); CSEL 58 (*Praefatio et indices*), Wien 1895–1923. English translation W. Parsons, *Letters*, vol. II (83–130); vol. III (131–164); vol. IV (165–203), (The Fathers of the Church, ed. R.J. Deferrari et al., vol. 18; 20; 30), Washington, D.C., 1953; 1953; 1955.
- Epistolae\** (= *Ep.*), ed. J. Divjak, BA 46B (*Lettres 1\*–29\**), Paris 1987.

- Epistolae ad Galatas expositionis liber unus* (= *Expos. Gal.*), ed. J. Divjak, *CSEL* 84, Wien 1971. English translation E. Plumer, *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians*, Oxford 2003.
- Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio* (= *Expos. Rom. inch.*), ed. J. Divjak, *CSEL* 84, Wien 1971. English translation P. Fredriksen Landes, *Augustine on Romans: Unfinished Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Texts and Translations, vol. 23, Early Christian Literature Series, vol. 6, ed. R.L. Wilken and W.R. Schoedel), Chico 1982.
- Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos* (= *Expos. prop. Rom.*), ed. J. Divjak, *CSEL* 84, Wien 1971. English translation P. Fredriksen Landes, *Augustine on Romans: Propositions from the Epistle to the Romans* (Texts and Translations, vol. 23, Early Christian Literature Series, vol. 6, ed. R.L. Wilken and W.R. Schoedel), Chico 1982.
- In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus decem* (= *In Ep. Ioh.*), ed. P. Agaësse, *SC* 75, Paris 1961. English translation H. Browne, *Homilies on the First Epistle of John* (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Ph. Schaff, vol. 7), Ann Arbor 1974 (1888<sup>1</sup>).
- In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV* (= *In Ioh.*), ed. R. Willems, *CCL* 36, Turnhout 1954. English translation J.W. Rettig, *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, 1–10; 11–27; 28–54; 55–111; 112–124 (The Fathers of the Church, ed. Th.P. Halton, vol. 78; 79; 88; 90; 92), Washington, D.C., 1988; 1988; 1993; 1994; 1995.
- Quaestiones evangeliorum* (= *Quaest. evang.*), ed. A. Mutzenbecher, *CCL* 44B, Turnhout 1980.
- Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri septem* (= *Quaest. Hept.*), ed. I. Fraipont, *CCL* 33, Turnhout 1958.
- Retractationum libri II* (= *Retract.*), ed. A. Mutzenbecher, *CCL* 57, Turnhout 1984. English translation M. Inez Bogan, *The Retractions* (The Fathers of the Church, ed. R.J. Deferrari, vol. 60), Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Sermones* (= *Serm.*), ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 38, Paris 1865. English translation E. Hill, *Sermons (145–183) on the New Testament* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. III/5), New York 1992.
- Sermones in epistolas apostolicas, i.e. sermones CLI–CLVI* (= *Serm.*), ed. G. Partoens, *CCL* 41Ba, Turnhout 2008. English translation E. Hill, *Sermons (145–183) on the New Testament* (The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle, vol. III/5), New York 1992.
- Soliloquiorum libri II* (= *Solil.*), ed. W. Hörmann, *CSEL* 89, Wien 1986. English translation T.F. Gilligan, *Soliloquies* (The Fathers of the Church, ed. L. Schopp, vol. 5), New York 1948.

#### Other Sources

- Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De excessu fratris Satyri*, ed. O. Faller, *CSEL* 73, Wien 1955.
- , *De paradiso*, ed. C. Schenkl, *CSEL* 32/1, Wien 1896.
- , *De Noe*, ed. C. Schenkl, *CSEL* 32/1, Wien 1896.
- , *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, ed. C. Schenkl, *CSEL* 32/4, Wien 1902.
- , *Fragmenta in Esaïam*, ed. M. Adriaen, *CCL* 14, Turnhout 1957.
- Anonymus Budapestensis (Budapest, Ungarisches Nationalmuseum, *Codex Latinus*

- Medii Aevi I*), ed. H.J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, I–II, Freiburg i. B. 1973–1974.
- Aristoteles, *Categoriae*, ed. I. Bekker (*Opera*, I), Berlin 1831 (reprint 1960).
- , *De motu animalium*, ed. I. Bekker (*Opera*, I), Berlin 1831 (reprint 1960).
- , *Ethica Eudemia*, ed. I. Bekker (*Opera*, II), Berlin 1831 (reprint 1960).
- , *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. I. Bekker (*Opera*, II), Berlin 1831 (reprint 1960).
- , *Rhetorica*, ed. I. Bekker (*Opera*, II), Berlin 1831 (reprint 1960).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *Academica*, ed. J.S. Reid, London 1885 (reprint Hildesheim—Zürich—New York 1984).
- , *De divinatione*, ed. O. Plasberg—W. Ax, Stuttgart 1977 (*M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, 46; originally published in 1938).
- , *De fato*, ed. O. Plasberg—W. Ax, Stuttgart 1977 (*M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, 46; originally published in 1938).
- , *De inventione*, ed. G. Achard, Paris 1994.
- , *De natura deorum libri tres*, ed. J.B. Mayor—J.H. Swainson, I–III, Cambridge 1883–1891.
- , *Hortensius*, ed. L. Straume-Zimmermann—F. Broemser—O. Gigon, Darmstadt 1990.
- , *Topica*, ed. M.L. Riccio Coletti, Chieti Scalo 1994.
- Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, I–VI, ed. O. Stählin—L. Früchtel—U. Treu, *GCS* 15, Clemens Alexandrinus, II, Berlin 1985<sup>4</sup>.
- Collectio Vaticana*, *ACO* I,1,3, ed. E. Schwartz, Berlin—Leipzig 1927.
- Concilia Africae* (A. 345–A. 525), ed. C. Munier, *CCL* 149, Turnhout 1974.
- Conciliarum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo et al., Bologna 1973<sup>3</sup>.
- Cyprianus Carthaginensis, *Ad Donatum*, ed. C. Moreschini, *CCL* 3A, Turnhout 1976.
- , *Ad Quirinum*, ed. R. Weber, *CCL* 3, Turnhout 1972.
- , *Epistularium*, ed. G.F. Diercks, *CCL* 3C (*Ep.* 58–81), Turnhout 1996.
- Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, ed. H.S. Long, I–II, Oxford 1964.
- Hieronymus, Eusebius Sophronius, *Adversus Iovinianum libri duo*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 23, Paris 1845.
- , *Apologia adversus libros Rufini*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 23, Paris 1845.
- , *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 23, Paris 1845.
- , *Commentarii in Ionam prophetam*, ed. M. Adriaen, *CCL* 76, Turnhout 1969, 377–419.
- , *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*, ed. C. Moreschini, *CCL* 80, Turnhout 1990.
- , *Epistulae*, III (121–154), ed. I. Hilberg, *CSEL* 56, Wien—Leipzig 1918.
- Iohannes Cassianus, *Collationes*, ed. E. Pichery, *SC* 42; 54; 64, Paris 1955; 1956; 1959.
- Julianus Aeclanensis, *Ad Florum*, quoted in: Augustinus, *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*, ed. M. Zelzer (post E. Kalinka), *CSEL* 85/1 (I–III), Wien 1974; *CSEL* 85/2 (IV–VI), Wien 2004.
- , *Ad Turbantium (fragmenta)*, ed. A. Bruckner, *Die vier Bücher Julians an Turbantius. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik Julians und Augustins*, Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, Berlin 1910 (reprint Aalen 1973), reprinted with modifications in: *Iuliani Aeclanensis operum deperditorum fragmenta*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, *CCL* 88, Turnhout 1978.
- , *Epistula quam ad Romanos misisse dicebatur Iulianus*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, *CCL* 88, Turnhout 1978.

- , *et alii, Epistula Iuliano communis cum pluribus Pelagianis episcopis ad Rufum Thessalonicensem*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, CCL 88, Turnhout 1978.
- , *Expositio libri Iob*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, CCL 88, Turnhout 1978.
- , *Theodori Mopsuesteni expositiones in Psalmos*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, CCL 88A, Turnhout 1977.
- , *Tractatus prophetarum Osee, Iohel et Amos*, ed. L. de Coninck—M.-J. d'Hont, CCL 88, Turnhout 1978.
- Kierkegaard, S., *The Sickness unto Death*, translated by W. Lowrie, Princeton 1941.
- Luther, Martin, *Tischreden*, ed. O. Brenner *et. al.* (D. Martin Luthers Werke, vol. IV–V), Weimar 1916 and 1919.
- Mani (?), *Epistula ad Menoch*, ed. M. Stein, in: *Manichaica Latina*, 1, Opladen 1998.
- Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani*, in: ACO I,1,3, ed. E. Schwartz, Berlin—Leipzig 1927, 5–23.
- Optatus Milevensis, *Libri septem (de schismate Donatistarum)*, ed. C. Ziwsa, CSEL 26, Wien 1893.
- Origenes, *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*, V–VI, ed. Th. Heither, FC 2/3, Freiburg i. B. 1993.
- , *De principis libri IV*, ed. H. Crouzel—M. Simonetti, SC 252–253, 268–269, 312, Paris 1978–1984.
- Paulinus Nolensis, *Carmina*, ed. G. de Hartel—M. Kamptner, CSEL 30, 1999<sup>2</sup>.
- Pelagius (?), *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, ed. G. de Plinval, *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélagie. Suivi du traité inédit De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, Fribourg en Suisse 1947.
- , *De natura* (fragments), ed. J.-P. Migne, PL 48, Paris 1846, 598–606.
- , *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, ed. J.-P. Migne, PL 30, 15–45 (= PL 33, 1099–1121), Paris 1865.
- , *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli*, ed. A. Souter (Texts and Studies IX,2), Cambridge 1926.
- , *Pro libero arbitrio* (fragments), ed. J.-P. Migne, PL 48, Paris 1846, 611–613.
- Plotinus, *Enneades*, ed. P. Henry—H.R. Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera*, I–III, Paris—Bruxelles 1951–1973.
- Plutarchus Chaeronensis, *De communibus notitiis adversus Stoicos*, ed. M. Casevitz (Plutarque, *Œuvres morales*, XV, traité 72), Paris 2002.
- Porphyrus, *Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes*, ed. E. Lamberz, Leipzig 1975.
- Rufinus Presbyter, *Liber de fide. A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. M.W. Miller, Washington, D.C., 1964.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*, II, ed. L.D. Reynolds, Oxford 1965.
- , *Phaedra*, in: *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*, ed. R. Peiper—G. Richter, Leipzig 1902.
- Tertullianus, *De anima*, ed. J.H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1947.
- Tyconius, *Regulae*, ed. F.C. Burkitt (Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, III/1, ed. J. Armitage Robinson), Cambridge 1895 (reprint Nendeln, Liechtenstein 1967); reprinted in: SC 488, introduction, traduction et notes J.-M. Vercruysse, Paris 2004.
- Vergilius Maro, Publius, *Eclogae*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (*Opera*), Oxford 1969.

*Literature*

- Aalders, G.J.D., "L'Épître à Menoch, attribuée à Mani", in: *VCh* 14, 1960, 245–249.
- Agaësse, P., "Introduction", in: *SC* 75 (Saint Augustin, *Commentaire de la Première épître de s. Jean*), Paris 1961, 7–14.
- Alfaric, P., *L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin I. Du manichéisme au néoplatonisme*, Paris 1918.
- Alflatt, M.E., "The Development of the Idea of Involuntary Sin in St. Augustine", in: *REAug* 20, 1974, 113–134.
- , "The Responsibility for Involuntary Sin in Saint Augustine", in: *RechAug* 10, 1975, 171–186.
- Altaner, B., "Augustinus und die griechische Sprache", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967, 129–153.
- , "Augustinus und Origenes", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967, 224–252.
- , "Die Benützung von original griechischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967, 154–163.
- , *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, *TU* 83, Berlin 1967.
- , "Der *Liber de fide*, ein Werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des 'Syrers'", in: idem, *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967, 467–482.
- Arnold, J., "Begriff und heilsökonomische Bedeutung der göttlichen Sendungen in Augustinus' *De Trinitate*", in: *RechAuch* 25, 1991, 3–69.
- Arendt, H., *The Life of the Mind*, II: *Willing*, New York 1978.
- Augustinus Magister. Congrès international augustinien (Paris, 21–24 septembre 1954)*, Paris 1954.
- Babcock, W.S., "Augustine and Tychonius. A Study in the Latin Appropriation of Paul", in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1982, 1209–1215.
- , "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans (A.D. 394–396)", in: *AugSt* 10, 1979, 55–74.
- Baguette, Ch., "Une période stoïcienne dans l'évolution de la pensée de saint Augustin", in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 47–77.
- Bammel, C.P., see Hammond Bammel, C.P.
- Barclift, Ph.L., "In Controversy with Saint Augustine: Julian of Eclanum on the Nature of Sin", in: *RThAM* 58, 1991, 5–20.
- Bastiaensen, A.A., "Augustin commentateur de saint Paul et l'Ambrosiaster", in: *SE* 36, 1996, 37–65.
- Bavaud, G., "Introduction", in: *BA* 29 (*Traité anti-donatistes II*), Paris 1964, 7–51.
- Beatrice, P.F., "*Quosdam platoniorum libros*. The Platonic Readings of Augustine in Milan", in: *VCh*, 43, 1989, 248–281.
- , *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milano 1978.
- Beierwaltes, W., *Regio Beatitudinis. Zu Augustins Begriff des glücklichen Lebens (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1981, 6)*, Heidelberg 1981.
- Bernard, R., "La prédestination du Christ total selon saint Augustin", in: *RechAug* 3, 1965, 1–58.
- Berrouard, M.-F., "Exégèse augustinienne de Rom. 7,7–25 entre 396 et 418 avec



- les remarques sur les deux premières périodes de la crise «pélagienne», in: *RechAug* 16, 1981, 101–195.
- , *Introduction aux Homélies de s. Augustin sur l'Evangile de s. Jean*, Paris 2004.
- Berthold, F., Jr., "Free Will and Theodicy in Augustine: An Exposition and Critique", in: *Religious Studies*, 17, 1981, 525–535.
- Bochet, I., «*Le firmament de l'Écriture*». *L'herméneutique augustinienne*, Paris 2004.
- , "«La lettre tue, L'Esprit vivifie». L'exégèse augustinienne de 2Co 3,6", in: *NRTh* 114, 1992, 341–370.
- Böhling, A., s. v. "Manichäismus", in: *TRE* 22, Berlin—New York 1991, 25–45.
- Bohlin, T., *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis*, Uppsala—Wiesbaden 1957.
- Bok, N.W. den, "Freedom of the Will. A Systematic and Biographical Sounding of Augustine's Thoughts on Human Willing", in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 237–270.
- Bonner, G., *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism* (Saint Augustine Lecture 1970), Villanova 1972.
- , *Augustine and Pelagianism*, in: *AugSt* 24, 1993, 27–47; reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (n. VII).
- , "Augustine's Conception of Deification", in: *JThS*, N.S., 37 (1986), 369–386; reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (n. I).
- , *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996.
- , "How Pelagian Was Pelagius? An Examination of the Contentions Torgny Bohlin", in: *StPatr* 27, 1993, 237–241; reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (n. III).
- , "Libido and Concupiscentia in St. Augustine", in: *StPatr* 6 (= *TU* 81), 1962, 303–314.
- , "Les origines africaines de la doctrine augustinienne sur la chute et le péché originel", in: *Augustinus*, ed. I. Oroz-Reta, Madrid 1967, 97–116.
- , "Pelagianism and Augustine", in: *AugSt* 23, 1992, 33–51; reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (n. VI).
- , *Saint Augustine of Hippo. Life and Controversies*, London 1963.
- , "Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism", in: *AugSt* 1, 1970, 31–47.
- , "The Significance of Augustine's *De gratia Novi Testamenti*", in: *Augustiniana*, 41, 1991, 531–559; reprinted in: idem, *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot—Brookfield 1996 (n. IV).
- Boublik, V., *La predestinazione. S. Paolo e S. Agostino*, Roma 1961.
- Bouton-Touboulic, A.-I., *L'ordre caché. La notion d'ordre chez saint Augustin*, Paris 2004.
- Bouwman, G., *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Roma 1958.
- Boyer, C., "Le système de saint Augustin sur la grâce. Paraphrase du *De correptione et gratia*", in: *RechSR* 20, 1930, 481–505.

- Brachtendorf, J. (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild. Augustins De Trinitate im Spiegel gegenwärtiger Forschung*, Paderborn 2000.
- , *Die Struktur des menschlichen Geistes nach Augustinus. Selbstreflexion und Erkenntnis Gottes in De Trinitate*, Hamburg 2000.
- Brandenhewer, O., "Augustinus über Röm. 7,14 ff.", in: *Miscellanea Agostiniana. Testi e studi pubblicati a cura dell'ordine eremitano di S. Agostino nel XV centenario dalla morte del santo dottore*, II, Roma 1931, 879–883.
- Brown, P., *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography (A New Edition with an Epilogue)*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 2000 (originally published in London 1967).
- , "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum", in: *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. E. Gabba, Como 1983, 49–70.
- , "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion", in: *JRS* 54, 1964, 107–116.
- , "The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy between East and West", in: idem, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972, 208–226.
- , "Pelagius and His Supporters: Aims and Environment", in: idem, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972, 183–207.
- , *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972.
- Bruckner, A., *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus*, TU 15/3, Leipzig 1897.
- Bruning, B., "De l'astrologie à la grâce", in: *Augustiniana*, 41, 1991 (= *Mélanges à T.J. Bavel*, II), 575–643.
- Bruyne, D. de, *Les Fragments de Freising (épîtres de S. Paul et épîtres catholiques)*, Roma 1921.
- , "Saint Augustin, reviseur de la Bible", in: *Miscellanea Agostiniana. Testi e studi pubblicati a cura dell'ordine eremitano di S. Agostino nel XV centenario dalla morte del santo dottore*, II, Roma 1931, 521–606.
- Buonaiuti, E., "Manichaeism and Augustine's Idea of *massa perditionis*", in: *HThR* 20, 1927, 117–127.
- Burns, J.P., *Development of Augustine's Doctrine of Operative Grace*, Paris 1980.
- , s.v. "Grace", in: *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, ed. A.D. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids—Cambridge 1999, 391–398.
- , "The Interpretation of Romans in the Pelagian Controversy", in: *AugSt* 10, 1979, 43–54.
- , "Providence as Divine Grace in St. Augustine", in: P.-Y. Fux—J.-M. Roessli—O. Wermelinger (eds.), *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1–7 avril 2001*, Fribourg 2003, I, 211–218.
- Canning, R., *The Unity of Love for God and Neighbour in St. Augustine*, Heverlee—Leuven 1993.
- Capánaga, V., "La doctrina Agustiniana de la gracia en los Salmos", in: *StPatr* 6 (= *TU* 81), 1962, 315–349.
- Cary, P., *Inner Grace: Augustine in the Traditions of Plato and Paul*, Oxford 2008.
- Casiday, A.M.C., "Cassian, Augustine, and *De incarnatione*", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 41–47.
- Cayré, F., "Le livre XIII des Confessions", in: *REAug* 50, 2004, 143–161.
- Chadwick, O., *John Cassian*, Cambridge 1968<sup>2</sup>.

- Chappell, T.D.J., *Aristotle and Augustine on Freedom: Two Theories of Freedom, Voluntary Action and Akrasia*, London—New York 1995.
- Chéné, J., “Que signifiaient *initium fidei* et *affectus credulitatis* pour les semipélagiens?”, in: *RechSR* 35, 1948, 566–588.
- , “Le semipélagianisme du midi de la Gaule d’après les lettres de Prosper d’Aquitaine et d’Hilaire à saint Augustin”, in: *RechSR* 43, 1955, 321–341.
- Cipriani, N., “Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino”, in: *Augustinianum*, 38, 1998, 413–428.
- , “L’altro Agostino di G. Lettieri”, in: *REAug* 48, 2002, 249–265.
- , “Aspetti letterari dell’*Ad Florum* di Giuliano d’Eclano”, in: *Augustinianum*, 15, 1975, 125–167.
- , “L’autore dei testi pseudobasiliani riportati nel C. Iulianum (I, 16–17) e la polemica agostiniana di Giuliano d’Eclano”, in: *Congresso internazionale su s. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione, Roma, 15–20 settembre 1986: Atti*, I, Roma 1987, 439–449.
- , “La morale pelagiana e la retorica”, in: *Augustinianum*, 31, 1991, 309–327.
- , “Echi antiapollinaristici e aristotelismo nella polemica di Giuliano d’Eclano”, in: *Augustinianum*, 21, 1981, 373–389.
- , “L’utilizzazione di Fil. 3,13–14 nell’opera di s. Agostino”, in: *Augustiniana*, 56, 2006, 299–320.
- Cirilo, L.—Tongerloo, A. van (ed.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico”*, Louvain—Napoli 1997.
- Clark, E.A., “‘Adam’s Only Companion’: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage”, in: *RechAug* 21, 1986, 139–162.
- , “Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine’s Manichean Past”, in: eadem, *Ascetic Piety and Women’s Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Lewiston 1986, 291–349.
- Congar, Y., “Introduction générale”, in: *BA* 28 (*Traité anti-donatistes I*), Paris 1963, 7–133.
- Courcelle, P., *Les Confessions de saint Augustin dans sa tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité*, Paris 1963.
- , *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin*, Paris 1950, 1968<sup>2</sup>.
- Coyle, J.K., “What Did Augustine Know about Manichaeism when He Wrote His Two Treatises *De moribus*?”, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 43–56.
- Deane, H.A., *The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine*, New York—London 1963.
- De Capitani, F., “*Quomodo sit manifestum deum esse*: Lettura del libro II”, in: L.F. Pizzolato (ed.), “*De Libero Arbitrio*” di Agostino d’Ippona, Palermo 1990, 35–57.
- , “Studio introduttivo”, in: *Il “De Libero Arbitrio” di S. Agostino. Studio introduttivo, testo, traduzione e commento*, Milano 1987, 115–233.
- Decret, F., *Aspects du manichéisme dans l’Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Félix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970.
- , “Objectif premier visé par Augustin dans ses controverses orales avec les responsables manichéens d’Hippone”, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the*

- Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 57–66.
- , “L’utilisation des Épîtres de Paul chez les Manichéens d’Afrique”, in: J. Ries et al., *Le Epistole Paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Roma 1989, 29–83.
- Deferrari, R.J.—Keeler, M.J., “St. Augustine’s ‘City of God’: Its Plan and Development”, in: *American Journal of Philosophy*, 50, 1929, 109–137.
- Delaroche, B., *Saint Augustin, lecteur et interprète de saint Paul dans le De peccatorum meritis et remissione (hiver 411–412)*, Paris 1996.
- Desch, W., “Aufbau und Gliederung von Augustins Schrift *De vera religione*”, in: *VCh* 35, 1980, 263–277.
- Dewart, J. McW., “The Christology of the Pelagian Controversy”, in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1993, 1221–1244.
- Dideberg, D., *Saint Augustin et la Première épître de saint Jean. Une théologie de l’agapé*, Paris 1975.
- Dihle, A., *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 1982.
- Di Palma, G., “Ancora sull’interpretazione agostiniana di Rom 5,12: *et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt*”, in: *Augustinianum*, 44, 2004, 113–134.
- Djuth, M., s. v. “Will”, in: *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, ed. A.D. Fitzgerald, Grand Rapids—Cambridge 1999, 881–885.
- Dodaro, R., “*Ego miser homo*. Augustine, the Pelagian Controversy, and the Paul of Romans 7:7–25”, in: *Augustinianum*, 44, 2004, 135–144.
- , “Note on the Carthaginian Debate over Sinlessness, A.D. 411–412 (Augustine, *Pecc. mer.* 2.7,8–16,25)”, in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 187–202.
- Doignon, J., “Etat des questions relatives aux premiers Dialogues de saint Augustin”, in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989, 47–86.
- , “«J’acquiesce à la loi» (Rom. 7,16) dans l’exégèse latine ancienne”, in: *FZPhTh* 29, 1982, 131–139.
- Dolbeau, F., “Les Sermons augustinien de Mayence: bilan des travaux et mise à jour bibliographique (1996–2000)”, appendix in: idem, *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d’Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence*, Paris 2001.
- Dörries, H., “Das Verhältnis des Neuplatonischen und Christlichen in Augustins *de vera religione*”, in: *ZNW* 23, 1924, 64–102.
- Drecoll, V.H. (ed.), *Augustin-Handbuch*, Tübingen 2007.
- , *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Tübingen 1999.
- , s. v. “*Gratia*”, in: *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. C. Mayer, III, Basel 2004, 182–242.
- , “Innerkirchlicher Diskurs und Meinungsführerschaft—Augustins Gnadenlehre in synodalen Texten aus dem pelagianischen Streit”, in: Th. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008, 205–220.
- , “*Mens—notitia—amor*. Gnadenlehre und Trinitätslehre in *De Trinitate* IX und in *De peccatorum meritis/De spiritu et littera*”, in: J. Brachtendorf (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild. Augustins De Trinitate im Spiegel gegenwärtiger Forschung*, Paderborn 2000, 137–153.

- Dunphy, W., "Marius Mercator on Rufinus the Syrian. Was Schwartz Mistaken?", in: *Augustinianum*, 32, 1992, 279–288.
- , "Rufinus the Syrian: Myth and Reality", in: *Augustiniana*, 59, 2009, 79–157.
- , "The Lost Manuscript of Pseudo-Rufinus: *De fide*", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 89–103.
- Duval, Y.-M., "La correspondance entre Augustin et Pélage", in: *REAug* 45, 1999, 363–384.
- , "La date du *De natura* de Pélage. Les premières étapes de la controverse sur la nature de la grâce", in: *REAug* 36, 1990, 257–283.
- , "*Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus*. La première édition—incomplète—de l'œuvre de Julien d'Éclane", in: *REAug* 25, 1979, 162–170.
- , "Lettre 4\*" (note complémentaire), in: *BA* 46B (*Lettres 1\*–29\**), ed. J. Divjak, Paris 1987, 430–442.
- , "Pélage en son temps: Données chronologiques nouvelles pour une présentation nouvelle", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 95–118.
- , "Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'*Adversus Iovinianum* à Rome en 393? Ou: du «portrait-robot» de l'hérétique chez s. Jérôme", in: *RHE* 75, 1980, 525–557.
- Eßer, H.H., "Thesen und Anmerkungen zum exegetischen Paulusverständnis des Pelagius", in: E. Wolf—H. Gollwitzer—J. Hoppe (eds.), *Zwischenstation. Festschrift für K. Kupisch zum 60. Geburtstag*, München 1963, 27–42.
- Evans, G.R., *Augustine on Evil*, Cambridge 1982.
- , "Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee", in: *VCh* 35, 1981, 232–246.
- Evans, R.F., *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, New York 1968.
- Feldmann, E., "Der junge Augustinus und Paulus. Ein Beitrag zur (manichäischen) Paulus-Rezeption", in: L. Cirilo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico"*, Louvain—Napoli 1997, 41–76.
- Ferguson, J., *Pelagius. A Historical and Theological Study*, Cambridge 1956 (reprint New York 1988).
- Ferrari, L.C., "The Pear-Theft in Augustine's Confessions", in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 233–242.
- Fidelibus, G., "Grazia e storicità nel disegno del *De civitate Dei*: Un percorso di ragione", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 225–254.
- Fiedrowicz, M., *Psalmus vox totius Christi. Studien zu Augustins Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Freiburg—Basel—Wien 1998.
- Fischer, N. (ed.), *Freiheit und Gnade in Augustins Confessiones. Der Sprung ins lebendige Leben*, Paderborn 2003.
- Fitzgerald, A., "Ambrose and Augustine: *Confessio* as *Initium Iustitiae*", in: *Augustinianum*, 40, 2000, 173–185.
- Fitzgerald, A.D. (ed.), *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids—Cambridge 1999.
- Flasch, K., *Logik des Schreckens. Augustinus von Hippo, De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum I,2*, Mainz 1995<sup>2</sup>.
- Folliet, G., "Introduction", in: *CSEL* 92 (Augustinus, *Contra sermonem arrianorum, De correptione et gratia*, Wien 2000), 129–215.
- , "*Massa damnata—massa sanctorum* chez saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus minister et magister. Homenaje al prof. A. Turrado Turrado*, Madrid 1992, 95–109.

- Fontanier, J.-M., "Sur le traité d'Augustin *De pulchro et apto*: convenance, beauté et adaptation", in: *RSPHTh* 73, 1989, 413–421.
- Frede, H.J. (ed.), *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, I–II, Freiburg i. B. 1973–1974.
- Frede, M., *A Free Will: Origins of the Notion in Ancient Thought*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 2011.
- Fredouille, J.-C., "Les sermons d'Augustin sur la chute de Rome", in: G. Madec (ed.), *Augustin prédicateur (395–411)*, Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly 5–7. 9. 1996, Paris 1998, 439–448.
- Fredriksen, P., "Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy. Augustine and Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians", in: *RechAug* 23, 1988, 87–114.
- Frend, W.H.C., *The Donatist Church. A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford 1952.
- , "Donatus paene totam Africam decepit. How?", in: *JEH* 48, 1997, 611–627.
- Fuhrer, Th. (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008.
- , "Wollen oder Nicht(-)Wollen: Zum Willenskonzept bei Seneca", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 69–94.
- Gallay, J., "Dilige et quod vis fac. Notes d'exégèse augustinienne", in: *RechSR*, 43, 1955, 545–555.
- García-Sánchez, C., *Pelagius and Christian Initiation. A Study in Historical Theology* (PhD. diss., The Catholic University of America), Washington, D.C., 1978.
- R. Garrigou-Lagrange, "La grâce efficace et la grâce suffisante selon Saint Augustin", in: *Angelicum*, 31, 1954, 243–251.
- Gilson, E., *Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin*, Paris 1929.
- Girard, J.-M., *La mort chez saint Augustin. Grandes lignes de l'évolution de sa pensée, telle qu'elle apparaît dans ses traités*, Fribourg, Suisse 1992.
- Grasmück, E.L., *Coercitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit*, Bonn 1964.
- Greshake, G., *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz 1972.
- Grossi, V., "Il battesimo e la polemica pelagiana negli anni 411/413", in: *Augustinianum*, 9, 1969, 30–61.
- , "Correptio—correctio—emendatio in Agostino d'Ippona. Terminologia penitenziale e monastica", in: *Augustinianum*, 38, 1998, 215–222.
- , "La crisi antropologica nel monastero di Adrumeto", in: *Augustinianum*, 19, 1979, 103–133.
- , *La liturgia battesimale in S. Agostino. Studio sulla catechesi del peccato originale negli anni 393–412*, Roma 1993.
- , "Il peccato originale nella catechesi di s. Agostino prima della polemica pelagiana", in: *Augustinianum*, 10, 1970, 325–359, 458–492.
- Guy, J.-C., *Unité et structure logique de la « Cité de Dieu » de saint Augustin*, Paris 1961.
- Hadot, P., "Citations de Porphyre chez Augustin. A propos d'un ouvrage récent", in: *REAu* 6, 1960, 205–244.
- Haider, F., "Augustinus und das psychologische Problem des freien Willens", in: E. Herbrich (ed.), *Der Mensch als Persönlichkeit und Problem. Philosophische*

- Überlegungen und psychologische Erfahrungen (Gedenkschrift für I. Betschart)*, München 1963, 231–255.
- (Hammond) Bammel, C.P., “Augustine, Origen and the Exegesis of St. Paul”, in: *Augustinianum*, 32, 1992, 341–368.
- , “The Last Ten Years of Rufinus’ Life and the Date of His Move South from Aquileia”, in: *JThS*, N.S., 28, 1977, 372–429.
- , *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*, Freiburg 1985.
- Hanby, M., *Augustine and Modernity*, London 2003.
- Harl, M., “Recherches sur l’origénisme d’Origène: la satiété (κόρος) de la contemplation comme motif de la chute des âmes”, in: *StPatr* 8, 1966, 373–405.
- Harnack, A. von, “Augustins Konfessionen”, in: idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, I, Gießen 1906<sup>2</sup>, 49–79.
- , *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III, Tübingen 1910<sup>4</sup>.
- Harrison, C., “*Delectatio Victrix*: Grace and Freedom in Saint Augustine”, in: *StPatr* 27, 1993, 298–302.
- , *Rethinking Augustine’s Early Theology: An Argument for Continuity*, Oxford 2006.
- Harrison, G.—BeDuhn, J., “The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?) Mani’s Letter to Menoch”, in: P. Mirecki—J. BeDuhn (ed.), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Leiden 2001, 128–172.
- Hendriks, E., “La date de composition du *De Trinitate* de saint Augustin”, in: *L’année théologique augustinienne*, 12, 1952, 305–316.
- Hoffmann, A., “Verfälschung der Jesus-Tradition. Neutestamentliche Texte in der Manichäisch-Augustinischen Kontroverse”, in: L. Cirilo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico”*, Louvain—Napoli 1997, 149–182.
- Holte, R., “St. Augustine on Free Will (*De libero arbitrio*, III)”, in: L.F. Pizzolato (ed.), *“De Libero Arbitrio” di Agostino d’Ippona*, Palermo 1990, 67–84.
- Holtzen, T.L., “The Therapeutic Nature of Grace in St. Augustine’s *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*”, in: *AugSt* 2000, 93–115.
- Hombert, P.-M., “Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat (395–411)”, in: G. Madec (ed.), *Augustin prédicateur (395–411)*, *Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly* 5.–7. 9. 1996, Paris 1998, 217–245.
- , *Gloria gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Paris 1996.
- , *Nouvelles recherches de chronologie augustinienne*, Paris 2000.
- Honnay, G., “*Caelestius, discipulus Pelagii*”, in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 271–302.
- Horn, Ch., “Augustinus und die Entstehung des philosophischen Willensbegriffs”, in: *ZPhF* 50, 1996, 113–132.
- Huftier, M., “Libre arbitre, liberté et péché chez saint Augustin”, in: *RThAM* 33, 1966, 187–281.
- Inglebert, H., *Les romains chrétiens face à l’histoire de Rome. Histoire, christianisme et romanité en Occident dans l’Antiquité tardive (III<sup>e</sup>–V<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Paris 1996.
- Janssen, K., *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Rostock 1936.
- Jonas, H., *Augustin und das paulinische Freiheitsproblem. Ein philosophischer Beitrag zur Genesis der christlichen Freiheitslehre*, Göttingen 1930.

- Jourjon, M., "Sarcina. Un mot cher à l'évêque d'Hippone", in: *RechSR* 43, 1955, 258–262.
- Kahn, Ch.H., "Discovering the Will. From Aristotle to Augustine", in: J.M. Dillon—A.A. Long (ed.), *The Question of "Eclecticism". Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*, Berkeley—Los Angeles—London 1988, 234–259.
- Karfiková, L., "Augustins Polemik gegen Apuleius", in: *Apuleius, De deo Socratis—Über den Gott des Sokrates*, eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen von M. Baltes, M.-L. Lakmann, J.M. Dillon, P. Donini, R. Häfner, L. Karfiková, Darmstadt 2004, 162–189.
- , "Merita nostra dona sunt eius. Die Pneumatologie und Gnadenlehre nach Augustin von Hippo, *De Trinitate*", in: Y. de Andia—P.L. Hofrichter (eds.), *Der Heilige Geist im Leben der Kirche. Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens* (Pro Oriente, vol. 29), Innsbruck—Wien 2005, 217–228.
- Karpp, H., *Probleme altchristlicher Anthropologie. Biblische Anthropologie und philosophische Psychologie bei den Kirchenvätern des dritten Jahrhunderts*, Gütersloh 1950.
- Kenny, A., *Aristotle's Theory of Will*, London 1979.
- Kirwan, C., *Augustine*, London 1989 (reprint 1991).
- Klíma, O., *Manis Zeit und Leben*, Praha 1962.
- Kobusch, Th., "Der Begriff des Willens in der christlichen Philosophie vor Augustinus", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 277–300.
- , "Die philosophische Bedeutung des Kirchenvaters Origenes. Zur christlichen Kritik an der Einseitigkeit der griechischen Wesensphilosophie", in: *ThQ* 165, 1985, 94–105.
- Kriegbaum, B., *Kirche der Traditoren oder Kirche der Martyrer? Die Vorgeschichte des Donatismus*, Innsbruck—Wien 1986.
- La Bonnardière, A.-M., *Recherches de chronologie augustiniennne*, Paris 1965.
- , "Le verset paulinien Rom. V,5 dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus Magister. Congrès international augustinien (Paris, 21–24 septembre 1954)*, II, Paris 1954, 657–665.
- Lamberigts, M., "Competing Christologies: Julian and Augustine on Jesus Christ", in: *AugSt* 36/1, 2005, 159–194.
- , "Julian and Augustine on the Origin of the Soul", in: *Augustiniana*, 46, 1996, 243–260.
- , "Julian of Aeclanum: a Plea for a Good Creator", in: *Augustiniana*, 38, 1988, 5–24.
- , "Julian of Aeclanum on Grace: Some Considerations", in: *StPatr* 27, 1993, 342–349.
- , "Julian von Aeclanum und seine Sicht der Gnade: Eine Alternative?", in: C. Mayer, A.E.J. Grote, Ch. Müller (eds.), *Gnade—Freiheit—Rechtfertigung. Augustinische Topoi und ihre Wirkungsgeschichte (Internationales Kolloquium zum 1650. Geburtstag Augustins vom 25. bis 27. November 2004 im Erbacher Hof zu Mainz)*, Mainz—Stuttgart 2007, 95–122.
- , "Julien d'Éclane et Augustin d'Hippone. Deux conceptions d'Adam", in: *Augustiniana*, 40, 1990, 373–410.



- , “Les évêques pélagiens déposés, Nestorius et Ephèse”, in: *Augustiniana*, 35, 1985, 264–280.
- , “Pelagius and Pelagians”, in: S. Ashbrook Harvey—D.G. Hunter (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, Oxford 2008, 258–279.
- , “Recent Research into Pelagianism with Particular Emphasis on the Role of Julian of Aeclanum”, in: *Augustiniana*, 52, 2002, 175–198.
- , “The Philosophical and Theological Background of Julian of Aeclanum’s Concept of Concupiscence”, in: Th. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.-25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008, 245–260.
- , *Was Augustine a Manichaean? The Assessment of Julian of Aeclanum*, in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 113–136.
- Lamirande, E., “Accusations lancées contre Augustin” (note complémentaire 17), in: *BA* 32 (*Traité anti-donatistes V*), Paris 1965, 711–712.
- Lancel, S., *Saint Augustin*, Paris 1999.
- Laurence, P., “Proba, Juliana et Démétrias. Le christianisme des femmes de la gens Anicia dans la première moitié du V<sup>e</sup> siècle”, in: *REAug* 48, 2002, 131–163.
- Lettieri, G., *L’altro Agostino. Ermeneutica e retorica della grazia dalla crisi alla metamorfosi del De doctrina christiana*, Brescia 2001.
- Léon-Dufour, X., “Grâce et libre arbitre chez saint Augustin. A propos de: *Consentire vocationi Dei ... propriae voluntatis est*”, in: *RechSR* 33, 1946, 129–163.
- Liebeschuetz, W., “Did the Pelagian Movement Have Social Aims?”, in: *Historia*, 12, 1963, 227–241.
- Löhr, W.A., “Augustin, Pelagius und der Streit um die christliche Lebensform”, in: Th. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen (Akten der Tagung vom 22.-25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)*, Stuttgart 2008, 221–243.
- , “Pelagius’ Schrift *De natura*: Rekonstruktion und Analyse”, in: *RechAug* 31, 1999, 235–294.
- López García, M.M., “El *De spiritu et littera* en el Concilio de Trento”, in: *Augustinianum*, 43, 2003, 201–217.
- Lössl, J., *Intellectus gratiae. Die Erkenntnistheorie und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre Augustins von Hippo*, Leiden—New York—Köln 1997.
- , “Intellektualistischer Voluntarismus—Der Willensbegriff Augustins von Hippo”, in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 301–330.
- , “Introduction”, in: *Aurelii Augustini Sermones in epistolas apostolicas*, ed. G. Partoens, *CCL* 41Ba, Turnhout 2008, XXIII–LV.
- , “Julian of Aeclanum on Pain”, in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 10, 2002, 203–243.
- , *Julian von Aeclanum. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001.
- , review of J.-M. Salamito, *Les virtuoses et la multitude. Aspects sociaux de*

- la controverse entre Augustin et les pélagiens*, Grenoble 2005, in: *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2006.02.50, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2006/2006-02-50.html>.
- Lyonnet, S., "A propos de Romains 5,12 dans l'œuvre de S. Augustin. Note complémentaire", in: *Biblica*, 45, 1964, 541–542.
- , "Augustin et Rm 5,12 avant la controverse pélagienne. A propos d'un texte de saint Augustin sur le baptême des enfants", in: *NRTh* 89, 1967, 842–850.
- , "Rom. V,12 chez saint Augustin. Note sur l'élaboration de la doctrine augustinienne du péché originel", in: *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père de Lubac*, I, Paris 1963, 327–339.
- Madec, G., "Augustin et Porphyre. Ébauche d'un bilan des recherches et des conjectures", in: M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Sofias maiétores. Chercheurs de sagesse (Hommage à J. Pépin)*, Paris 1992, 367–382.
- Madec, G. (ed.), *Augustin prédicateur (395–411)*, *Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly* 5.–7. 9. 1996, Paris 1998.
- , "Le *De civitate Dei* comme *De vera religione*", in: idem, *Petites études augustinienes*, Paris 1994, 189–213.
- , "Le milieu milanais. Philosophie et christianisme", in: *BLE* 88, 3–4, 1987, 194–205.
- , "Le néoplatonisme dans la conversion d'Augustin. Etat d'une question centenaire (depuis Harnack et Boissier, 1888)", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989, 9–25.
- , "*Unde malum?* Le livre I du *De libero arbitrio*", in: L.F. Pizzolato (ed.), "*De Libero Arbitrio*" di Agostino d'Ippona, Palermo 1990, 13–34.
- , *Saint Ambroise et la philosophie*, Paris 1974.
- Magris, A., "Augustins Prädestinationslehre und die manichäischen Quellen", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 148–160.
- Maier, J.-L., *Le dossier du donatisme*, I–II, Berlin 1987–1989.
- Mara, M.G., "L'influsso di Paolo in Agostino", in: J. Ries et al., *Le Epistole Paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Roma 1989, 125–162.
- Marafioti, D., *L'uomo tra legge e grazia. Analisi teologica del "De spiritu et littera" di S. Agostino*, Brescia 1983.
- Markus, R.A., "Imago and Similitudo in Augustine", in: *REAug* 10, 1964, 125–143.
- , *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine*, Cambridge 1970.
- Marrocco, M., "Participation in Divine Life in the *De trinitate* of St. Augustine", in: *Augustinianum*, 42, 2002, 149–185.
- Marrou, H.-I., "Les attaches orientales du Pélagianisme", in: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1968, 459–472.
- , "La canonisation de Julien d'Éclane", in: *HJ* 77, 1958, 434–437.
- , "Jean Cassien à Marseille", in: *Revue du Moyen Âge latin*, 1, 1945, 1–26.
- Martin, T.F., *Rhetoric and Exegesis in Augustine's Interpretation of Romans 7:24–25a*, Lewiston—Queenston—Lampeter 2001.

- Martinetto, G., "Les premières réactions antiaugustinienes de Pélagé", in: *REAug* 17, 1971, 83–117.
- Mayer, C.P., "Augustinus—*Doctor Gratiae*. Das Werden der augustinischen Gnadenlehre bis zur Abfassung der *Confessiones*", in: N. Fischer (ed.), *Freiheit und Gnade in Augustins Confessiones. Der Sprung ins lebendige Leben*, Paderborn 2003, 37\*–49\*.
- Mayer, C. (ed.), *Augustinus-Lexikon*, Basel 1994–.
- Mayer, C.—Chelius, K.H. (eds.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989.
- McCool, G.A., "The Ambrosian Origin of St. Augustine's Theology of the Image of God in Man", in: *Theological Studies*, 20, 1959, 62–81.
- McDonough, B.T., "The Notion of Order in St. Augustine's On Free Choice of the Will", in: *IThQ* 46, 1979, 51–55.
- McGrath, A.E., "Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum", in: *DR* 101, 1983, 312–319.
- Miscellanea Agostiniana. Testi e studi pubblicati a cura dell'ordine eremitano di S. Agostino nel XV centenario dalla morte del santo dottore*, II, Roma 1931.
- Moreau, M., *Le dossier Marcellinus dans la correspondance de saint Augustin*, Paris 1973.
- Moreschini, C., "Gerolamo tra Pelagio e Origene", in: *Augustinianum*, 26, 1986, 207–216.
- Morris, J., "Pelagian Literature", in: *JThS*, N.S., 16, 1965, 26–60.
- Mratschek, S., *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*, Göttingen 2002.
- Müller, J., "'Doch mein Zorn ist Herrscher über meine Pläne'—Willensschwäche aus der Sicht der Stoiker", in: idem—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 45–68.
- Müller, J.—Pich, R.H., "Auf dem Weg zum Willen? Eine problemgeschichtliche Hinführung zur Genese des philosophischen Willensbegriffs in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike", in: idem (eds.), *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 1–22.
- (eds.), *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010.
- Myres, J.N.L., "Pelagius and the End of Roman Rule in Britain", in: *JRS* 50, 1960, 21–36.
- Naab, E., *Über Schau und Gegenwart des unsichtbaren Gottes (Texte mit Einführung und Übersetzung)*, Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt 1998.
- Niebergall, A., *Augustins Anschauung der Gnade. Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung vor dem Pelagianischen Streit (bis zum Abschluß der Confessiones)*, Göttingen 1951 (PhD diss., Marburg 1936), microfilm.
- Nuvolone, F.G.—Solignac, A., s. v. "Pélage et Pélagianisme", in: *DSp* 12/2, 1986, 2889–2942.
- Nyren, G., *Das Prädestinationsproblem in der Theologie Augustins. Eine systematisch-theologische Studie*, Lund 1956.
- O'Connell, R.J., "De libero arbitrio I: Stoicism revisited", in: *AugSt* 1, 1970, 49–68.
- O'Daly, G., *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind*, London 1987.
- O'Donnell, J.J., *Augustine, Sinner & Saint. A New Biography*, London 2005.

- Ogliari, D., *Gratia et Certamen. The Relationship between Grace and Free Will in the Discussion of Augustine with the so-called Semipelagians*, Leuven 2003.
- O'Meara, J.J., "Comment of Prof. O'Meara", in: *REAug* 6, 1960, 245–247 (reaction to P. Hadot, "Citations de Porphyre chez Augustin. A propos d'un ouvrage récent", *ibid.*, 205–244).
- , "The Historicity of the Early Dialogues of Saint Augustine", in: *VCh* 5, 1951, 150–178.
- , *Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*, Paris 1959.
- Oort, J. van, *Jerusalem and Babylon. A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden 1991.
- , "Manichaeism and Antimanichaeism in Augustine's Confessions", in: L. Cirillo—A. van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente cristiano antico"*, Louvain—Napoli 1997, 235–247.
- Oort, J. van—Wermelinger, O.—Wurst, G. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln, 2001.
- Partoens, G., "Introduction", in: *Aurelii Augustini Sermones in epistolas apostolicas*, ed. G. Partoens, *CCL* 41Ba, Turnhout 2008, IX–XXII, LVI–CLXXII.
- Perkams, M., "Ethischer Intellektualismus und Willensbegriff. Handlungstheorie beim griechischen und lateinischen Origenes", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 239–258.
- Perler, O., "Das Datum der Bischofsweihe des heiligen Augustinus", in: *REAug* 11, 1965, 25–37.
- Piault, B., "Autour de la controverse pélagienne. « Le troisième lieu »", in: *RechSR* 44, 1956, 481–514.
- Pich, R.H., "Προαίρεσις und Freiheit bei Epiktet: Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Geschichte des Willensbegriffs", in: J. Müller—R.H. Pich, *Wille und Handlung in der Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, Berlin 2010, 95–127.
- Pincherle, A. *La formazione teologica di Sant'Agostino*, Roma ca. 1940 (n.d.).
- Pizzolato, L.F. (ed.), *"De Libero Arbitrio" di Agostino d'Ippona*, Palermo 1990.
- Plagnieux, J., "Le grief de complicité entre erreurs nestorienne et pélagienne d'Augustin à Cassien par Prosper d'Aquitaine?", in: *REAug* 2, 1956, 391–402.
- , "Influence de la lutte antipélagienne sur le *De trinitate* ou Christocentrisme de Saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus Magister. Congrès international augustinien (Paris, 21–24 septembre 1954)*, II, Paris 1954, 817–826.
- Platz, Ph., *Der Römerbrief in der Gnadenlehre Augustins*, Würzburg 1937.
- Plinval, G. de, "Aspects du déterminisme et de la liberté dans la doctrine de saint Augustin", in: *REAug* 1, 1955, 347–378.
- , "Les écrits de Célestius" (note complémentaire 17), in: *BA* 21 (*La crise pélagienne I*), Paris 1966, 592–593.
- , *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme*, Lausanne 1943.
- , "Recherches sur l'œuvre littéraire de Pélage", in: *RPh* 8 (60), 1934, 9–42.
- Puech, H.-Ch. (ed.), *Histoire des religions*, II, Paris 1972.
- Quinot, B., "Les accusations de manichéisme portées par Petilianus" (note complémentaire 10), in: *BA* 30 (*Traité anti-donatistes III*), Paris 1967, 769–771.
- Rees, B.R., *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge 1988 (reprint 1991).

- Rebillard, E., "Augustin et ses autorités: l'élaboration de l'argument patristique au cours de la controverse pélagienne", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 245–263.
- Refoulé, F., "Datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagiens et du *Libellus fidei* de Rufin", in: *REAug* 9, 1963, 41–49.
- , "Julien d'Éclane, théologien et philosophe", in: *RechSR* 52, 1964, 42–84 and 233–247.
- , "La distinction «royaume de Dieu—vie éternelle» est-elle pélagienne?", in: *RechSR* 51, 1963, 247–254.
- Ries, J.—Decret, F.—Frend, W.H.C.—Mara, M.G., *Le Epistole Paoline nei Manichei, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Roma 1989.
- Ries, J., "Jésus Sauveur dans la controverse anti-manichéenne de saint Augustin", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 185–194.
- Ring, T.G., "Der Anfang des Glaubens: Verdienst oder Gnade?", in: *Augustiniana*, 54, 2004, 177–202.
- , "Bruch oder Entwicklung im Gnadenbegriff Augustins? Kritische Anmerkungen zu K. Flasch, *Logik des Schreckens. Augustinus von Hippo, Die Gnadenlehre von 397*", in: *Augustiniana*, 44, 1994, 31–113.
- Rist, J.M., *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized*, Cambridge 1994 (reprint 1997).
- , "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination", in: *JThS*, N. S., 20, 1969, 420–447; reprinted in: idem, *Platonism and its Christian Heritage*, London 1985 (n. XIII).
- , "Love and Will. Around *De Trinitate* XV,20,38", in: J. Brachtendorf (ed.), *Gott und sein Bild. Augustins De Trinitate im Spiegel gegenwärtiger Forschung*, Paderborn 2000, 205–216.
- Rondet, H., "Liberté et grâce selon saint Augustin", in: idem, *Essais sur la théologie de la grâce*, Paris 1964, 243–266.
- , "La prédestination augustinienne. Genèse d'une doctrine", in: *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, 18, 1966, 229–251.
- Roy, O. du, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391*, Paris 1966.
- Rudolph, K., "*Augustinus Manichaicus*—Das Problem von Konstanz und Wandel", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 1–15.
- Sage, A., "Les deux temps de grâce", in: *REAug* 7, 1961, 209–230.
- , "*Praeparatur voluntas a Domino*", in: *REAug* 10, 1964, 1–20.
- , "La prédestination chez saint Augustin d'après une thèse récente", in: *REAug* 6, 1960, 31–40.
- Salamito, J.-M., *Les virtuoses et la multitude. Aspects sociaux de la controverse entre Augustin et les pélagiens*, Grenoble 2005.
- Schmaus, M., *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Münster 1927.
- Schindler, A., s. v. "Afrika", I, in: *TRE* 1 (1977), 640–700.
- , "L'histoire du donatisme considérée du point de vue de sa propre théologie", in: *StPatr* 17/3, 1982, 1306–1315.

- , "Die Theologie der Donatisten und Augustins Reaktion", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (ed.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989, 131–147.
- , *Wort und Analogie in Augustins Trinitätslehre*, Tübingen 1965.
- Schmucker, J., *Die Gnade des Urstandes und die Gnade der Auserwählten in Augustins De correptione et gratia*, Metten 1940.
- Scopello, M., "L'Epistula fundamenti à la lumière des sources manichéennes du Fayoum", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 205–229.
- Séjourné, P., "Les conversions de saint Augustin d'après le *De libero arbitrio*, L. I", in: *RSR* 25, 1951, 243–264 and 333–363.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G., "Au cœur du dualisme manichéen: La polémique augustiniennne contre la notion de «mutabilité» de Dieu dans le *Contra Secundinum*", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 230–242.
- Simonis, W., "Anliegen und Grundgedanke der Gnadenlehre Augustins", in: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*, 34, 1983, 1–21.
- , *Ecclesia visibilis et invisibilis. Untersuchungen zur Ekklesiologie und Sakramentenlehre in der afrikanischen Tradition von Cyprian bis Augustinus*, Frankfurt a. M. 1970.
- Smith, A.J., "The Commentary of Pelagius on Romans Compared with That of Origenes-Rufinus", in: *JThS* 20, 1919, 127–177.
- , "The Latin Sources of the Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, Part II: The Commentary of Pelagius on Romans Compared with Augustine, *Expositio Quarundam Propositionum ex Epistula ad Romanos and Epistulae ad Romanos Inchoata Expositio*", in: *JThS* 20, 1919, 55–65.
- , "Pelagius and Augustine", in: *JThS* 31, 1930, 21–35.
- Solignac, A., "Autour du *De natura* de Pélage", in: M. Soetard (ed.), *Valeurs dans le stoïcisme. Du Portique à nos jours. Textes rassemblés en hommage à M. Spanneut*, Lille 1993, 181–192.
- , "Le cercle milanais" (note complémentaire 1), in: *BA* 14 (*Les Confessions II*), Paris 1962, 529–536.
- , "Les excès de *intellectus fidei* dans la doctrine d'Augustin sur la grâce", in: *NRTh* 110, 1988, 825–849.
- , "Introduction", in: *BA* 13 (*Les Confessions I*), Paris 1962, 9–270.
- , "Introduction", in: *BA* 48 (*La Genèse au sens littéral en douze livres*), Paris 1972, 9–66.
- , "Réminiscences plotiniennes et porphyriennes dans le début du *De ordine* de saint Augustin", in: *Archives de philosophie*, 20, 1957, 446–465.
- , "La condition de l'homme pécheur d'après saint Augustin", in: *NRTh* 78, 1956, 359–385.
- Somers, H., "Image de Dieu. Les sources de l'exégèse augustiniennne", in: *REAug* 7, 1961, 105–125.

- Sontag, F., "Augustine's Metaphysics and Free Will", in: *HTHR* 60, 1967, 297–306.
- Sorabji, R., "The Concept of the Will from Plato to Maximus the Confessor", in: T. Pink—M.W.F. Stone, *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, London 2004, 6–28.
- Souter, A., *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul* (Texts and Studies, IX/1), Cambridge 1926.
- Speigel, J., "Der Pelagianismus auf dem Konzil von Ephesus", in: *AHC* 1, 1969, 1–14.
- Stein, M., "Einleitung", in: *Epistula ad Menoch, Manichaica Latina*, 1, Opladen 1998, 27–44.
- Strand, N., "Augustine on Predestination and Divine Simplicity: The Problem of Compatibility", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 290–305.
- Strauss, R., "Der neue Mensch innerhalb der Theologie Augustins", Zürich 1967.
- Studer, B., *Gratia Christi—Gratia Dei bei Augustinus von Hippo. Christozentrismus oder Theozentrismus?*, Roma 1993.
- , "Zur Pneumatologie des Augustinus von Hippo (*De Trinitate* 15,17,27–27,50)", in: *Augustinianum*, 35, 1995, 567–583.
- Stump, E., "Augustine on Free Will", in: eadem—N. Kretzmann (eds.), in: *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, Cambridge 2001, 124–147.
- Sullivan, J.E., *The Image of God. The Doctrine of St. Augustine and its Influence*, Dubuque (Iowa) 1963.
- Svoboda, K., *L'Esthétique de saint Augustin et ses sources*, Brno 1933.
- Taranto, S., "Giovanni Cassiano e Agostino: la dottrina della grazia", in: C. Badilata—J. Attila (eds.), *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Actes du colloque international organisé par le New Europe College en collaboration avec la Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft (Bucarest 27–28 septembre 2001)*, Paris 2003, 65–132.
- Tardieu, M., *Le manichéisme*, Paris 1981.
- , "Principes de l'exégèse manichéenne de Nouveau Testament", in: idem (ed.), *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146.
- TeSelle, E., *Augustine the Theologian*, London 1970.
- , "Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius. Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy", in: *AugSt* 3, 1972, 61–95.
- Testard, M., *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, I, Paris 1958.
- Theiler, W., "Porphyrios und Augustin", in: idem, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin 1966, 160–248 (originally in: *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 10/1, Halle 1933).
- Thonnard, F.-J., "Justice de Dieu et justice humaine selon saint Augustin", in: *Augustinus*, 12 (45–48), 1967, 387–402.
- , "La notion de liberté en philosophie augustinienne", in: *REAug* 16, 1970, 243–270.
- , "La prédestination augustinienne. Sa place en philosophie augustinienne", in: *REAug* 10, 1964, 97–123.
- Tornau, C., "Augustinus und die intelligible Materie. Ein Paradoxon griechischer Philosophie in der Genesis-Auslegung der *Confessiones*", in: *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, N.F. 34, 2010, 115–150.
- Trapé, A., "Verso una riabilitazione del pelagianesimo?", in: *Augustinianum*, 3, 1963, 482–516.
- Valero, J.B., "El estoicismo de Pelagio", in: *Estudios eclesiásticos*, 57, 1982, 39–63.

- Van Fleteren, F., "Augustine's Evolving Exegesis of Romans 7: 22–23 in its Pauline Context", in: *AugSt* 32/1, 2001, 89–114.
- Vannier, M.-A., "L'interprétation augustinienne de la création et l'émanatisme manichéen", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 287–306.
- Veer, A.C. de, "Aux origines du *De natura et origine animae* de saint Augustin", in: *REAug* 50, 2004, 121–157.
- , "Rom. 14,23b dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin (*Omne quod non est ex fide, peccatum est*)", in: *RechAug* 8, 1972, 149–185.
- Verschoren, M., "The Appearance of the Concept *concupiscentia* in Augustine's Early Antimanichaeic Writings (388–391)", in: *Augustiniana*, 52, 2002, 199–240.
- Vessey, M., "*Opus imperfectum*. Augustine and His Readers, 426–435 A.D.", in: *VCh* 52, 1998, 264–285.
- Voelke, A.-J., *L'idée de volonté dans le stoïcisme*, Paris 1973.
- Weaver, R.H., *Divine Grace and Human Agency. A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*, Macon 1996.
- Weber, D., "Augustinus, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Zu Augustins Darstellung und Widerlegung der manichäischen Kritik am biblischen Schöpfungsbericht", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 228–306.
- , "Klassische Literatur im Dienst theologischer Polemik: Julian von Eclanum, *Ad Florum*", in: *StPatr* 38, 2001, 503–509.
- Wermelinger, O., "Décision du concile africain de 418 sur la grâce et la liberté, présentée par Augustine à Boniface, évêque de Rome", in: P.-Y. Fux—J.-M. Roesli—O. Wermelinger (eds.), *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Acts du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1–7 avril 2001*, Fribourg Suisse 2003, 219–226.
- , "Der Pelagiusdossier in der *Tractoria* des Zosimus", in: *FZPhTh* 26, 1979, 336–368.
- , "Neuere Forschungsperspektiven um Augustinus und Pelagius", in: C. Mayer—K.H. Chelius (eds.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*, Würzburg 1989, 189–217.
- , s. v. "Pelagius", in: *LThK* 8, 1999<sup>3</sup>, 5–8.
- , *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975.
- Wetzel, J., *Augustine and the Limits of Virtue*, Cambridge 1992.
- Wickham, L., "Pelagianism in the East", in: R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge 1989, 200–213.
- Wurst, G., "Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *Genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve", in: J. van Oort—O. Wermelinger—G. Wurst (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden—Boston—Köln 2001, 307–324.



- Zeoli, A., *La teologia agostiniana della Grazia fino alle Quaest. ad Simpl. (396)*, Napoli 1963.
- Zum Brunn, E., *Le dilemme de l'être et du néant chez saint Augustin. Des premiers dialogues aux Confessions*, Paris 1969.
- Zumkeller, A., "Eph. 5,27 im Verständnis Augustins und seiner donatistischen und pelagianischen Gegner", in: *Augustinianum*, 16, 1976, 457–474.

## INDICES



# I

## INDEX LOCORUM

### I.1. BIBLIA

#### I.1.1. *Vetus Testamentum*

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Deuteronomium</i>	
1-3	25	5:21	236, 256n. 295
1-2	216		
1	100n. 54, 120n. 129	<i>ISamuelis</i>	
1:3-4	269, 269n. 366	10:10	72
1:4	101	16:14	72
1:26-27	216, 241, 243	15:11	72
2	120n. 129	28:12-19	72
2:2	28, 101, 122, 216		
2:7	216	<i>II Samuelis</i>	
2:8	328	7:18	72
2:21-23	215		
2:22	216	<i>I(III) Regum</i>	
2:24	321	17:20	72
2:25	299	22:19-23	72
3	26, 29, 92n. 17,		
	233	<i>Iob</i>	
3:5	26, 269	1:1	194
3:7	27, 299	1:9	93, 113
3:12	26	10:9	117
3:16-19	321	14:4-5 LXX	91, 122
3:16	328n. 158	25:4	91, 122
6:1-7	274n. 399	33:14	117
17:12-14	207	42:10	230
21:9-13	146n. 72		
32:30	224	<i>Psalmi</i>	
		1-32	46
<i>Exodus</i>		21:28 [22:28]	245
3:14	270	24:17 LXX, V	192
7:3	260	36[37]:4	249
10:1	54	39:5[40:4]	237
20:17	236, 256n. 295	48[49]:13	243n. 211
		50:7 [51:5]	91, 122, 124

*Psalmi (cont.)*

57:11[58:10]	81
72[73]:28	237
79[80]:8	251n. 265
81[82]:6	47, 253n. 276
118[119]	254–257
118[119]:20	255n. 295
118[119]:65	256n. 296
118[119]:66	256n. 296
134[135]:6	284
142[143]:10	256n. 298

*Proverbia*

2:19	120
3:34 LXX	90
8:35 LXX	265n. 346, 279, 289n. 476

*Ecclesiastes*

7:17	251
------	-----

*Canticum Canticorum*

4:12	141
6:8[9]	141

*Sapientia*

8:21	97n. 37, 125
11:21	112

*Ecclesiasticus*

3:17	92
3:20	125, 125n. 153
3:22	222
3:34	125
15:18	279
18:30	234
40:1	255n. 290

*Isaias*

8:20 LXX	322n. 126
42:5	222
45:11 LXX	284

*Ieremias*

17:5	137
31:29–30	332n. 185

*Ezechiel*

3:18	285
18:1–20	332n. 185

*Zacharias*

12:1	222
------	-----

*Malachias*

1:2–3	210
-------	-----

*II Machabaeorum*

7:22	223
------	-----

I.1.2. *Novum Testamentum**Evangelium sec. Matthaeum*

5:8	224
5:9	49
5:45	48
6:12	165
7:13–14	153
10:16	38
12:30	176
12:48–50	110
13:29–30	143
17:24–27	235
19:5–6	321
20:1–16	332

20:16	77
22:14	53, 77
23:37	323n. 132
25:1–13	231n. 115

*Evangelium sec. Marcum*

3:29 parr.	61
10:14 parr.	306

*Evangelium sec. Lucam*

1:28	289
2:14	51, 59
7:42–43	116

14:23	151	3:20	184
20:37-38	174n. 38	3:27	183
23:40-43	140, 142	4:5	136
		4:11	207
<i>Evangelium sec. Iohannem</i>		5:5	24, 24n. 44, 47, 122, 143, 154, 164, 182, 193, 238, 244n. 219, 247, 250, 259n. 320
1:8	111n. 43	5:8	327
1:12-13	243	5:12	173, 174, 206, 219, 304, 320
1:12	253	5:14	255n. 289
1:14	62, 108, 109, 246, 322n. 126	5:16	333n. 196
1:16	126, 280	5:18	176, 223
1:18	108, 224	6:1	116
1:33	141n. 50	6:2	52
3:5	129	6:4	122
3:8	206	6:6	174n. 34
3:21	116	6:20	308
6:44	146, 148, 151, 249, 308	6:23	280
6:65	164	7-9	35, 49
9:2-3	328n. 157	7:1-8:11	55
10:28	252	7	64n. 133, 72, 94, 192, 239, 235n. 159, 239n. 193, 265, 266n. 347, 310, 317, 340
10:29	252	7:5-8:17	213, 232, 293
15:5	164, 236, 250	7:7-25a	72
15:15	251	7:7	183, 236
15:16	252	7:13	236
16:13	250	7:14-24	302
17:2	252	7:14 ff.	350n. 19
17:10	253	7:14	74
17:24	247n. 234	7:15-23	60
19:24	253	7:15	37n. 7, 38, 235
20:23	144n. 63	7:16	37n. 11, 235, 271, 344
		7:17	254, 301, 309, 334
<i>Actus Apostolorum</i>		7:18-19	37n. 7, 40
7:55	72	7:18	72 f., 233, 234
8:9-24	138n. 33	7:19	330n. 175, 335n. 209
8:18-24	113	7:20	233, 254, 301 f., 309, 334, 342, 344
9:3-9	86, 151	7:22-25	94n. 27
17:18	237	7:22-25a	55, 56n. 95, 302n. 21
17:28	121	7:22-23	235
19:1-5	138n. 27		
<i>Ep. ad Romanos</i>			
1:7	49, 60		
1:18-32	190		
1:21	226		
2:13	184		
2:14-15	182n. 82		

*Ep. ad Romanos (cont.)*

7:22	259, 303, 310	3:7	148, 202
7:23-25	37	3:15	199
7:23	93, 123, 125n. 152, 190,	3:16	225
	302, 316	3:21	136
7:24	234, 302, 318	4:7	46n. 52, 79, 85, 122,
7:25	193, 233		126, 148, 185, 245,
7:25b	56		266n. 350, 287,
8:2	238	5:6	288n. 476
8:3	174n. 34, 178, 234	6:17	152
8:10	173	12:4-6	225, 225n. 77
8:15-16	52	12:12-27	226
8:17	47, 322n. 126	12:6	46
8:20	255n. 287	13:1-4	53
8:24	318	13:4	138
8:26	28	13:7	259n. 320
8:28	202	13:12	259n. 320
8:29	62, 108	15:9-10	227
8:32	152	15:10	197
9	57, 59n. 106, 69, 75,	15:22	125, 279
	169n. 11, 214, 263,	15:44	80
	266, 287		234
9:6-29	75n. 18	<i>Ep. II ad Corinthios</i>	
9:10-29	72	2:16	116
9:10-13	53	3:6	183
9:11	206, 214, 219, 221	3:17	225n. 77
9:13	210	3:18	245
9:14	186	5:21	234
9:16	52, 77, 78, 80	11:2	110n. 35
9:18	80	12:2-4	225
9:20	81	12:9	203
9:21	57, 153, 334n. 205	<i>Ep. ad Galatas</i>	
10:3	237	2:20	63
10:10	140	2:21	190, 193
11:33-34	211	3:27	62
11:33	186, 211, 252n. 269	4:5	47
12:2	243	4:6	72
12:21	279	4:19	63
13:1-7	150	5:4	55n. 94
13:1	185	5:6	164, 247
13:13-14	95	5:11-14	62
14:23b	316n. 97	5:13	61

*Ep. I ad Corinthios*

1:12-13	148	5:17	37n. 7, 192, 255n. 290,
1:31	46n. 52, 85, 136		256n. 295, 271, 316
2:14	251n. 266		

*Ep. ad Ephesios*

1:4	119, 120, 247n. 234
1:5	47, 164
2:3	37n. 7, 109, 329
2:8–9	125
2:8	121
2:9	120
4:15–16	46
4:24	245
5:1	243
5:8	111
5:27	142, 165

*Ep. ad Philippenses*

2:6	62
2:13	59, 78, 78n. 25, 116, 121, 201, 259, 259n. 319, 275
3:12–14	194
3:12	236
3:13–14	194n. 165
4:13	97

*Ep. ad Colossenses*

1:13	164
3:1–3	238
3:10	243, 245
3:25	310

*Ep. II ad Thessalonicenses*

3:8	113n. 64
-----	----------

*Ep. I ad Timotheum*

2:4	186 f., 264, 284
-----	------------------

*Ep. Iacobi*

2:19	248n. 241
3:8	190
4:6	90, 125

*Ep. I Petri*

5:5	90
-----	----

*Ep. II Petri*

1:4	196
2:19	260

*Ep. I Iohannis*

1:8	125n. 158, 179
2:19	139
3:2	224
3:9	125n. 158
4:10	114, 248
4:18	230

*Apocalypsis*

2:11	271
20:6	271
21:8	271

## I.2. AUGUSTINUS

*Adnotationes in Iob*

9: CSEL 28/3,3, 529	117n. 104	36: CSEL 28/3,3, 588	117n. 109
9: CSEL 28/3,3, 531	117n. 105; 107	36: CSEL 28/3,3, 593	116n. 94
10: CSEL 28/3,3, 532	117n. 111	37: CSEL 28/3,3, 595	116n. 100
16: CSEL 28/3,3, 544	117n. 108	37: CSEL 28/3,3, 597 f.	116n. 97
23: CSEL 28/3,3, 556	116n. 101	37: CSEL 28/3,3, 598	116n. 93; 99
28: CSEL 28/3,3, 569	118n. 113	37: CSEL 28/3,3, 599 f.	116n. 96
30: CSEL 28/3,3, 575, 13 f.		38: CSEL 28/3,3, 600	117n. 103
	117n. 102	38: CSEL 28/3,3, 606	116n. 95; 97, 117n. 110
33: CSEL 28/3,3, 581	118n. 112	38: CSEL 28/3,3, 608	116n. 98
		38: CSEL 28/3,3, 614	117n. 106



*Adnotationes in Iob (cont.)*

- 38: *CSEL* 28/3,3, 616 118n. 113  
 39: *CSEL* 28/3,3, 623 111n. 46

*Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*

- III,3,3: *BA* 32, 134 133n. 3  
 III,7,9: *BA* 32, 150 89n. 5  
 III,8,11: *BA* 32, 158 146n. 74  
 III,8,14: *BA* 32, 162–164 137n. 21  
 III,9,16: *BA* 32, 168 142n. 55  
 III,10,19–20: *BA* 32, 176–178 142n. 55

*Confessiones*

- I,1,1: *CCL* 27, 1 90n. 8  
 I,2,2–5,6: *CCL* 27, 1–3 91n. 9  
 I,6,7: *CCL* 27, 4 91n. 10  
 I,7,11–12: *CCL* 27, 6 f. 91n. 11  
 I,10,16: *CCL* 27, 9 91n. 12  
 I,12,19: *CCL* 27, 11, 12 f. 91n. 13  
 II,4,9: *CCL* 27, 22, 16 f. 92n. 16  
 II,4,9: *CCL* 27, 22, 17 92n. 14  
 II,5,11: *CCL* 27, 23, 26 92n. 15  
 II,6,14: *CCL* 27, 24 92n. 17  
 II,7,15: *CCL* 27, 25 92n. 18  
 III,3,5: *CCL* 27, 29, 1 92n. 20  
 III,6,11: *CCL* 27, 33 99n. 52  
 III,11,20: *CCL* 27, 38 15n. 1  
 IV,3,5: *CCL* 27, 42 90n. 8  
 IV,13,20–15,27: *CCL* 27, 50–54 7n. 1  
 IV,15,26: *CCL* 27, 53 90n. 8  
 V,3,3: *CCL* 27, 58 8n. 6  
 V,6,10: *CCL* 27, 61 15n. 1  
 V,9,16: *CCL* 27, 66, 3 f. 92n. 19  
 VI,11,20: *CCL* 27, 87 97n. 37  
 VI,13,23: *CCL* 27, 89 93n. 22  
 VII,1,1–2: *CCL* 27, 92 f. 8n. 6  
 VII,5,7: *CCL* 27, 96 8n. 6, 100n. 53  
 VII,6,10: *CCL* 27, 99 102n. 67  
 VII,9,13: *CCL* 27, 101 90n. 8  
 VII,10,16: *CCL* 27, 103 f. 99n. 51  
 VII,14,20: *CCL* 27, 106 8n. 6  
 VII,21,27: *CCL* 27, 110 f. 93n. 24  
 VIII,1,1: *CCL* 27, 113 71n. 5

VIII,2,3–5,10: *CCL* 27, 114–119

71n. 1

VIII,2,3: *CCL* 27, 114

7n. 3, 71n. 3

VIII,2,4: *CCL* 27, 115

71n. 4

VIII,7,16: *CCL* 27, 123

95n. 30

VIII,9,21: *CCL* 27, 126

95n. 31

VIII,12,29: *CCL* 27, 131

95n. 32

VIII,12,30: *CCL* 27, 132

95n. 33

IX,1,1: *CCL* 27, 133

95n. 34,

96n. 35

IX,8,17–13,37: *CCL* 27, 143–154

99n. 51

IX,10,23–25: *CCL* 27, 147 f.

99n. 51

X,6,8: *CCL* 27, 159

98n. 44

X,17,26: *CCL* 27, 169

98n. 45

X,20,29: *CCL* 27, 170 f.

98n. 46

X,21,31: *CCL* 27, 172

98n. 46

X,22,32: *CCL* 27, 172

98n. 47

X,24,35–37: *CCL* 27, 174 f.

98n. 48

X,27,38: *CCL* 27, 175, 12

92n. 21

X,28,39: *CCL* 27, 175 f.

99n. 50

X,29,40: *CCL* 27, 176

97n. 38

X,31,44: *CCL* 27, 178

97n. 39

X,31,45: *CCL* 27, 178 f.

97n. 40

X,36,59: *CCL* 27, 187

90n. 8

X,37,60: *CCL* 27, 188

97n. 42

X,38,63: *CCL* 27, 190

97n. 41

X,42,67–43,69: *CCL* 27, 192 f.

98n. 49

XI,11,13: *CCL* 27, 201

100n. 55

XI,31,41: *CCL* 27, 215 f.

100n. 56

XII,15,18: *CCL* 27, 224

100n. 58

XII,15,18: *CCL* 27, 225

101n. 59

XII,28,38: *CCL* 27, 237

101n. 59

XII,29,40: *CCL* 27, 239

101n. 60

XIII,1,1: *CCL* 27, 242

101n. 61

XIII,3,4: *CCL* 27, 243

101n. 63

XIII,11,12: *CCL* 27, 247 f.

241n. 201

XIII,14,15: *CCL* 27, 250

102n. 69

XIII,15,17: *CCL* 27, 251

98n. 47

XIII,18,22: *CCL* 27, 254

101n. 65

XIII,23,33: *CCL* 27, 261

102n. 66

XIII,23,33: *CCL* 27, 262

102n. 68

XIII,34,49: *CCL* 27, 271

101n. 62

- XIII,36,51–37,52: *CCL* 27, 272  
101n. 64
- Contra Academicos*  
I,2,5: *CCL* 29, 6f. 9n. 11  
II,23: *CCL* 29, 30 7n. 2
- Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*  
I,1,1: *CCL* 49, 35 264n. 341  
I,16,29: *CCL* 49, 56 f. 264n. 341  
I,16,30: *CCL* 49, 57 f. 264n. 341  
I,16,32: *CCL* 49, 60 264n. 341  
I,16,34–17,35: *CCL* 49, 62–64 264n. 341  
I,24,51: *CCL* 49, 84 264n. 341  
II,11,37: *CCL* 49, 123 264n. 341  
II,12,40: *CCL* 49, 129 f. 264n. 341
- Contra Cresconium*  
I,24,29: *BA* 31, 126 138n. 32  
I,25,30: *BA* 31, 128–130 138n. 32  
I,29,34: *BA* 31, 136–138 139n. 38  
I,34,40: *BA* 31, 148 153n. 108  
II,3,4: *BA* 31, 156 137n. 26  
II,4,6: *BA* 31, 162 137n. 26  
II,7,9: *BA* 31, 168 137n. 26  
II,9,11: *BA* 31, 172 154n. 112  
II,10,12: *BA* 31, 174–176 139n. 41  
II,12,15–13,16: *BA* 31, 184–186 139n. 40  
II,15,18: *BA* 31, 188–190 141n. 50  
II,16,20: *BA* 31, 194 138n. 32  
II,21,26: *BA* 31, 212 142n. 54  
II,33,42: *BA* 31, 248 153n. 107  
II,34,43: *BA* 31, 250–252 134n. 7  
III,1–2,2: *BA* 31, 266–268 134n. 7  
III,7,7: *BA* 31, 280 136n. 13  
III,9,9: *BA* 31, 284 148n. 78  
III,47,51: *BA* 31, 378 145n. 68  
III,50,55: *BA* 31, 384 145n. 69  
III,51,56: *BA* 31, 384–386 145n. 70  
III,51,57: *BA* 31, 386–388 145n. 71
- III,52,58: *BA* 31, 388 146n. 74  
III,59,65: *BA* 31, 404–406 146n. 74  
III,78,90–79,91: *BA* 31, 454–456 89n. 5  
III,81,93: *BA* 31, 458 140n. 44  
IV,5,6: *BA* 31, 478–480 139n. 39  
IV,20,23–24: *BA* 31, 516–520 136n. 13  
IV,22,27: *BA* 31, 524 148n. 80  
IV,26,33: *BA* 31, 534 141n. 46  
IV,59,71: *BA* 31, 618 153n. 104
- Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*  
I,1,1–3: *CSEL* 60, 423 f. 308n. 53  
I,2,5: *CSEL* 60, 425 f. 308n. 54  
I,3,6–7: *CSEL* 60, 428 f. 308n. 56  
I,3,7: *CSEL* 60, 429 308n. 55  
I,8,13: *CSEL* 60, 433 310n. 65  
I,9,15: *CSEL* 60, 436 308n. 58  
I,10,17: *CSEL* 60, 439 310n. 64  
I,10,18: *CSEL* 60, 440 309n. 61  
I,10,20: *CSEL* 60, 442 309n. 62  
I,10,22: *CSEL* 60, 443 310n. 63  
I,11,23–24: *CSEL* 60, 443 f. 310n. 64  
I,19,37: *CSEL* 60, 454 308n. 57  
I,20,38: *CSEL* 60, 455 f. 310n. 67; 69  
II,2,2: *CSEL* 60, 461 f. 311n. 73  
II,2,3: *CSEL* 60, 462 f. 311n. 74  
II,2,4: *CSEL* 60, 463 310n. 72  
II,3,5: *CSEL* 60, 463 163n. 20  
II,5,9: *CSEL* 60, 468 f. 310n. 66  
II,5,9–6,12: *CSEL* 60, 469–472 310n. 71  
II,9,20–21: *CSEL* 60, 481 f. 310n. 68  
II,9,21: *CSEL* 60, 483 309n. 58, 309n. 59  
III,4,13: *CSEL* 60, 501 309n. 60  
III,8,24: *CSEL* 60, 516 310n. 66  
III,9,25: *CSEL* 60, 517 f. 312n. 75
- Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti*  
12,14: *BA* 17, 420 325n. 137  
37: *BA* 17, 492–494 108n. 24

*Contra epistulam Parmeniani*

I,2,2: BA 28, 212–214	133n. 3
I,9,15: BA 28, 244–246	146n. 72
I,14,21: BA 28, 260	143n. 57
II,4,8: BA 28, 286	140n. 44
II,5,10: BA 28, 290	136n. 13
II,7,12: BA 28, 294	152n. 99
II,7,13–14: BA 28, 294–298	153n. 104
II,8,15: BA 28, 302	136n. 13
II,9,19: BA 28, 310–312	139n. 35
II,10,20: BA 28, 312–314	153n. 104
II,10,22: BA 28, 324	136n. 15
II,11,24: BA 28, 328–330	144n. 64
II,13,27: BA 28, 336–338	148n. 81
II,13,28: BA 28, 340	138n. 29
II,13,28: BA 28, 342	138n. 32
II,13,29: BA 28, 344	138n. 28
II,13,31: BA 28, 350	137n. 24
II,14,32: BA 28, 354	137n. 19
II,21,40: BA 28, 376	141n. 46
II,22,42: BA 28, 380	134n. 6,
	152n. 101
III,2,5: BA 28, 398	152n. 102
III,3,18: BA 28, 438	152n. 103
III,5,26: BA 28, 460	153n. 105
III,5,28: BA 28, 468	153n. 105

*Contra Faustum*

II,5: CSEL 25/1, 259	108n. 16
III,3: CSEL 25/1, 264 f.	109n. 27
XII,14: CSEL 25/1, 344	108n. 22
XIII,6: CSEL 25/1, 384	111n. 50
XIV,3–4: CSEL 25/1, 405 f.	108n. 20
XIV,5: CSEL 25/1, 406	124n. 146
XV,4: CSEL 25/1, 423	108n. 17
XV,8: CSEL 25/1, 433	108n. 18
XVII,6: CSEL 25/1, 489	108n. 17; 23
XIX,7: CSEL 25/1, 505	108n. 21
XIX,8–9: CSEL 25/1, 506 f.	108n. 19
XIX,18: CSEL 25/1, 517	108n. 19
XIX,27: CSEL 25/1, 529	108n. 17; 23
XIX,29: CSEL 25/1, 532 f.	124n. 148

XX,6–7: CSEL 25/1, 540 f.	111n. 48
XX,9: CSEL 25/1, 546	111n. 50
XX,17: CSEL 25/1, 557 f.	111n. 50
XXI,14: CSEL 25/1, 587	111n. 50
XXI,16: CSEL 25/1, 589 f.	111n. 50
XXII,8: CSEL 25/1, 597	111n. 48
XXII,39: CSEL 25/1, 632	110n. 36
XXII,48: CSEL 25/1, 640 f.	113n. 63
XXV,2: CSEL 25/1, 727	112n. 51
XXVIII,5: CSEL 25/1, 742	111n. 50
XXIX,4: CSEL 25/1, 746 f.	124n. 148

*Contra Felicem*

I,7–8: BA 17, 660–662	124n. 148
I,19: BA 17, 694–696	111n. 50
II,1: BA 17, 700–704	111n. 50
II,4: BA 17, 710	108n. 16
II,11: BA 17, 728	109n. 30
II,17: BA 17, 740–744	109n. 26
II,18: BA 17, 744–746	109n. 26

*Contra Fortunatum*

15: BA 17, 148	37n. 8
15: BA 17, 148–150	39n. 17
20: BA 17, 162–164	37n. 8
20: BA 17, 166	37n. 9
21: BA 17, 174	37n. 10; 11
22: BA 17, 174–176	38n. 12
22: BA 17, 176–178	38n. 13
22: BA 17, 180	38n. 14
22: BA 17, 180–182	38n. 15
25: BA 17, 184	39n. 16
27: BA 17, 186	38n. 15
34: BA 17, 190	38n. 15

*Contra Iulianum*

I,9,42: NBA 18/1, 502	318n. 109
II,3,5: NBA 18/1, 516–518	316n. 99
II,9,31: NBA 18/1, 558	313n. 79
II,10,36: NBA 18/1, 570	161n. 12
III,1,2: NBA 18/1, 578	313n. 78

- III,1,4: *NBA* 18/1, 580 313n. 78  
 III,4,10: *NBA* 18/1, 590 314n. 84  
 III,5,11: *NBA* 18/1, 590 313n. 79; 81  
 III,6,13: *NBA* 18/1, 592–594 314n. 82  
 III,7,14: *NBA* 18/1, 594 314n. 83  
 III,13,26–27: *NBA* 18/1, 608–610 317n. 102  
 III,14,28–15,29: *NBA* 18/1, 612–614 317n. 103  
 III,15,29: *NBA* 18/1, 612–614 314n. 88  
 III,17,31: *NBA* 18/1, 614 298n. 3  
 III,21,46: *NBA* 18/1, 632 315n. 91  
 III,26,60: *NBA* 18/1, 648 313n. 80  
 III,26,62: *NBA* 18/1, 650–652 316n. 98  
 IV,2,8: *NBA* 18/1, 666 317n. 102  
 IV,3,15: *NBA* 18/1, 676 313n. 79  
 IV,3,21: *NBA* 18/1, 688 316n. 96  
 IV,3,24: *NBA* 18/1, 690–692 316n. 97  
 IV,3,33: *NBA* 18/1, 702–704 316n. 97  
 V,14,51: *NBA* 18/1, 838 314n. 86  
 V,15,58: *NBA* 18/1, 844 318n. 105  
 V,16,65: *NBA* 18/1, 852 314n. 85  
 VI,6,16: *NBA* 18/1, 882–884 314n. 87  
 VI,14,44–15,45: *NBA* 18/1, 920–922 318n. 108  
 VI,17,51: *NBA* 18/1, 932 315n. 92  
 VI,18,53: *NBA* 18/1, 934 317n. 101  
 VI,18,54: *NBA* 18/1, 936 315n. 90  
 VI,18,57: *NBA* 18/1, 940 314n. 85  
 VI,19,60: *NBA* 18/1, 946 315n. 89  
 VI,19,61: *NBA* 18/1, 948 317n. 100  
 VI,19,62: *NBA* 18/1, 948–950 316n. 93;  
 95,  
 317n. 104  
 VI,21,67: *NBA* 18/1, 958 313n. 81  
 VI,23,72: *NBA* 18/1, 962–964 316n. 94  
 VI,23,73: *NBA* 18/1, 964–966 316n. 99  
 VI,24,79: *NBA* 18/1, 972 315n. 91  
 VI,26,83: *NBA* 18/1, 980 318n. 106  
*Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*  
*prae*f.: *CSEL* 85/1, 3 f. 298n. 4  
 I,1: *CSEL* 85/1, 5 324n. 135  
 I,3: *CSEL* 85/1, 7 329n. 165  
 I,6: *CSEL* 85/1, 9 325n. 142  
 I,22: *CSEL* 85/1, 19 f. 331n. 181  
 I,24: *CSEL* 85/1, 21 331n. 181  
 I,25: *CSEL* 85/1, 22 329n. 165  
 I,27: *CSEL* 85/1, 23 325n. 142  
 I,35: *CSEL* 85/1, 26 327n. 152,  
 330n. 173  
 I,36: *CSEL* 85/1, 26 f. 328n. 160  
 I,38: *CSEL* 85/1, 28 327n. 152,  
 332n. 193  
 I,44: *CSEL* 85/1, 31 326n. 148  
 I,44: *CSEL* 85/1, 32 330n. 175  
 I,47: *CSEL* 85/1, 34 f. 330n. 175  
 I,48: *CSEL* 85/1, 36–38 327n. 151  
 I,48: *CSEL* 85/1, 40 330n. 171  
 I,49: *CSEL* 85/1, 42 330n. 174  
 I,50: *CSEL* 85/1, 42 327n. 153  
 I,50: *CSEL* 85/1, 44 329n. 165  
 I,53: *CSEL* 85/1, 49 323n. 130  
 I,54: *CSEL* 85/1, 51 330n. 173  
 I,57: *CSEL* 85/1, 54 327n. 151  
 I,62: *CSEL* 85/1, 58 325n. 139  
 I,63: *CSEL* 85/1, 59 f. 329n. 166  
 I,66: *CSEL* 85/1, 64 322n. 128  
 I,66: *CSEL* 85/1, 65 332n. 182  
 I,67: *CSEL* 85/1, 69 326n. 145  
 I,67: *CSEL* 85/1, 72 329n. 165  
 I,69–70: *CSEL* 85/1, 77 ff. 328n. 162  
 I,70: *CSEL* 85/1, 78 326n. 147  
 I,71: *CSEL* 85/1, 81 326n. 146  
 I,71: *CSEL* 85/1, 82 f. 331n. 180  
 I,72: *CSEL* 85/1, 85 329n. 166  
 I,75: *CSEL* 85/1, 91 325n. 142  
 I,76: *CSEL* 85/1, 92 331n. 179  
 I,78–79: *CSEL* 85/1, 93 f. 320n. 112  
 I,79: *CSEL* 85/1, 94 332n. 192  
 I,79–80: *CSEL* 85/1, 94 f. 333n. 194  
 I,82: *CSEL* 85/1, 96 324n. 113

*Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*

(cont.)

- I,85: CSEL 85/1, 97 328n. 134  
 I,88: CSEL 85/1, 101 f. 331n. 179  
 I,91: CSEL 85/1, 104 331n. 179  
 I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105 323n. 132,  
 334n. 205  
 I,93: CSEL 85/1, 105 f. 323n. 131,  
 333n. 197  
 I,94: CSEL 85/1, 107 327n. 155  
 I,94: CSEL 85/1, 109 322n. 126  
 I,94–95: CSEL 85/1, 109 f. 335n. 212  
 I,95: CSEL 85/1, 110 334n. 200  
 I,96: CSEL 85/1, 111 333n. 199  
 I,97: CSEL 85/1, 112 f. 324n. 136  
 I,98: CSEL 85/1, 116 333n. 194  
 I,99: CSEL 85/1, 117 335n. 209  
 I,100–101: CSEL 85/1, 118 333n. 198  
 I,101: CSEL 85/1, 118 334n. 200  
 I,101: CSEL 85/1, 119 335n. 212  
 I,104: CSEL 85/1, 121 334n. 206  
 I,106: CSEL 85/1, 124 335n. 209  
 I,109–110: CSEL 85/1, 129 332n. 185  
 I,116: CSEL 85/1, 133 f. 328n. 157  
 I,120: CSEL 85/1, 136 330n. 174  
 I,126: CSEL 85/1, 138 f. 334n. 205  
 I,127: CSEL 85/1, 139 f. 333n. 196  
 I,129–130: CSEL 85/1, 141 324n. 133  
 I,134: CSEL 85/1, 150 335n. 213  
 I,140: CSEL 85/1, 157 332n. 183  
 I,141: CSEL 85/1, 159 ff. 335n. 213  
 II,7: CSEL 85/1, 167 f. 329n. 169  
 II,14: CSEL 85/1, 172 325n. 142  
 II,15: CSEL 85/1, 172 334n. 208  
 II,22: CSEL 85/1, 177 329n. 166  
 II,27: CSEL 85/1, 181 325n. 142  
 II,42: CSEL 85/1, 193 329n. 170  
 II,47: CSEL 85/1, 195 f. 320n. 115  
 II,52: CSEL 85/1, 200 320n. 118  
 II,61: CSEL 85/1, 207 f. 320n. 118  
 II,87: CSEL 85/1, 224 333n. 195  
 II,122: CSEL 85/1, 253 322n. 124,  
 328n. 163  
 II,174: CSEL 85/1, 294 320n. 117  
 II,177: CSEL 85/1, 296 f. 329n. 169  
 II,178: CSEL 85/1, 297 325n. 142  
 II,178: CSEL 85/1, 299 329n. 169  
 II,186: CSEL 85/1, 304 328n. 161  
 II,187: CSEL 85/1, 306 332n. 184  
 II,194: CSEL 85/1, 309 321n. 119  
 II,216: CSEL 85/1, 327 332n. 185  
 II,223: CSEL 85/1, 336 f. 322n. 127  
 II,225: CSEL 85/1, 339 f. 332n. 186  
 II,226: CSEL 85/1, 340 f. 324n. 136  
 II,226: CSEL 85/1, 341 f. 332n. 191  
 II,228: CSEL 85/1, 343 f. 329n. 168  
 II,230: CSEL 85/1, 345 335n. 213  
 II,236: CSEL 85/1, 349 f. 331n. 181  
 III,2: CSEL 85/1, 352 327n. 152  
 III,4: CSEL 85/1, 353 329n. 169  
 III,7: CSEL 85/1, 354 327n. 153  
 III,11: CSEL 85/1, 355 321n. 120  
 III,25: CSEL 85/1, 366 330n. 171  
 III,27: CSEL 85/1, 367 332n. 193  
 III,32: CSEL 85/1, 370 f. 321n. 122  
 III,38: CSEL 85/1, 380 f. 329n. 169,  
 332n. 185  
 III,46: CSEL 85/1, 386 321n. 120  
 III,51: CSEL 85/1, 391 f. 332n. 185  
 III,69: CSEL 85/1, 403 327n. 155  
 III,77: CSEL 85/1, 405 327n. 154  
 III,84: CSEL 85/1, 408 f. 332n. 185  
 III,102: CSEL 85/1, 424 329n. 166  
 III,106: CSEL 85/1, 426 323n. 131,  
 332n. 187  
 III,109: CSEL 85/1, 429 f. 333n. 198,  
 335n. 212  
 III,110: CSEL 85/1, 432 333n. 194  
 III,112: CSEL 85/1, 433 334n. 207  
 III,120: CSEL 85/1, 438 334n. 202  
 III,122: CSEL 85/1, 439 f. 334n. 203,  
 335n. 212  
 III,147: CSEL 85/1, 453 328n. 164  
 III,151: CSEL 85/1, 456 323n. 129  
 III,154: CSEL 85/1, 459 f. 328n. 164  
 III,158: CSEL 85/1, 462 319n. 111  
 III,160–161: CSEL 85/1, 464–466 328n. 156  
 III,163: CSEL 85/1, 469 332n. 188

- III,166: *CSEL* 85/1, 469 324n. 137  
 III,172–187: *CSEL* 85/1, 473–488 324n. 137  
 III,172–173: *CSEL* 85/1, 473 f. 325n. 142  
 III,172: *CSEL* 85/1, 473 325n. 138  
 III,174: *CSEL* 85/1, 475 325n. 140  
 III,186: *CSEL* 85/1, 484 325n. 137  
 III,187: *CSEL* 85/1, 486 f. 325n. 140  
 III,187: *CSEL* 85/1, 489 328n. 164  
 III,188–190: *CSEL* 85/1, 492 f. 329n. 167  
 IV,2: *CSEL* 85/2, 5 327n. 153  
 IV,3: *CSEL* 85/2, 5 298n. 4  
 IV,5: *CSEL* 85/2, 10 298n. 4  
 IV,25: *CSEL* 85/2, 26 322n. 124  
 IV,30: *CSEL* 85/2, 29 322n. 125  
 IV,37: *CSEL* 85/2, 35 f. 322n. 125  
 IV,38: *CSEL* 85/2, 37–39 322n. 124  
 IV,38: *CSEL* 85/2, 39 f. 328n. 163  
 IV,41: *CSEL* 85/2, 42 328n. 163  
 IV,45–47: *CSEL* 85/2, 49–51 326n. 144  
 IV,49: *CSEL* 85/2, 53 f. 322n. 127  
 IV,52–54: *CSEL* 85/2, 56–60 331n. 182  
 IV,53: *CSEL* 85/2, 58 322n. 128  
 IV,57: *CSEL* 85/2, 63 f. 331n. 182  
 IV,87: *CSEL* 85/2, 88 f. 322n. 127  
 IV,90: *CSEL* 85/2, 94 f. 325n. 139  
 IV,91: *CSEL* 85/2, 96 f. 330n. 176  
 IV,100: *CSEL* 85/2, 103 335n. 211  
 IV,103: *CSEL* 85/2, 106 330n. 177  
 IV,104: *CSEL* 85/2, 108–111 330n. 171  
 IV,109: *CSEL* 85/2, 116 324n. 137, 325n. 137  
 IV,114: *CSEL* 85/2, 123 327n. 150  
 IV,114: *CSEL* 85/2, 124 328n. 164  
 IV,119: *CSEL* 85/2, 132 f. 326n. 147  
 IV,120: *CSEL* 85/2, 134 f. 325n. 139  
 IV,125: *CSEL* 85/2, 149 332n. 189  
 IV,131: *CSEL* 85/2, 158 332n. 189  
 IV,135: *CSEL* 85/2, 162 332n. 185  
 IV,136: *CSEL* 85/2, 163 f. 330n. 174  
 V,5: *CSEL* 85/2, 172 322n. 124  
 V,9: *CSEL* 85/2, 177 323n. 129  
 V,12: *CSEL* 85/2, 183 329n. 169  
 V,21: *CSEL* 85/2, 206 329n. 166  
 V,23: *CSEL* 85/2, 211 328 f.n. 164  
 V,25: *CSEL* 85/2, 217 325n. 137  
 V,30: *CSEL* 85/2, 225–227 325n. 141  
 V,32: *CSEL* 85/2, 231 326n. 143  
 V,38: *CSEL* 85/2, 235 f. 331n. 178  
 V,41: *CSEL* 85/2, 242 334n. 204  
 V,42: *CSEL* 85/2, 245 331n. 178, 332n. 190  
 V,46: *CSEL* 85/2, 250 327n. 149  
 V,47: *CSEL* 85/2, 253 334n. 201  
 V,50: *CSEL* 85/2, 255 f. 335n. 209  
 V,59: *CSEL* 85/2, 268 319n. 111  
 V,64: *CSEL* 85/2, 291 335n. 210  
 VI,11: *CSEL* 85/2, 313 f. 334n. 201  
 VI,14: *CSEL* 85/2, 332 328n. 161  
 VI,16: *CSEL* 85/2, 345 329n. 164  
 VI,21: *CSEL* 85/2, 362 320n. 114  
 VI,22: *CSEL* 85/2, 371 321n. 184  
 VI,25: *CSEL* 85/2, 380 f. 321n. 121  
 VI,26: *CSEL* 85/2, 387–393 328n. 158  
 VI,27: *CSEL* 85/2, 397–409 330n. 172  
 VI,27: *CSEL* 85/2, 397–401 328n. 159  
 VI,27: *CSEL* 85/2, 399–403 328n. 161  
 VI,30: *CSEL* 85/2, 416 f. 321n. 123  
 VI,31: *CSEL* 85/2, 423 322n. 127  
 VI,34: *CSEL* 85/2, 429 322n. 127  
 VI,36: *CSEL* 85/2, 440–442 330n. 172  
 VI,41: *CSEL* 85/2, 464 331n. 181
- Contra litteras Petiliani*  
 I,2,3–3,4: *BA* 30, 138–140 137n. 21  
 I,5,6: *BA* 30, 144 137n. 17  
 I,26,28: *BA* 30, 182 89n. 5  
 I,28,29: *BA* 30, 184 146n. 74  
 II,18,40: *BA* 30, 268 89n. 5  
 II,23,51–52: *BA* 30, 288–290 146n. 73

*Contra litteras Petiliani (cont.)*

II,23,52: BA 30, 288	147n. 76
II,30,69: BA 30, 310–312	137n. 20
II,32,74: BA 30, 320	139n. 39
II,37,85–87: BA 30, 338–344	138n. 27
II,39,94: BA 30, 356	140n. 44
II,55,126: BA 30, 390	139n. 34
II,66,147–148: BA 30, 408	146n. 73
II,68,153: BA 30, 412	146n. 73
II,71,159: BA 30, 416	146n. 73
II,77,172: BA 30, 428–430	139n. 34
II,78,173: BA 30, 430	146n. 73
II,83,183–184: BA 30, 442–444	147n. 75
II,83,184: BA 30, 446–450	146n. 74
II,84,185–186: BA 30, 450–452	147n. 75
II,84,186: BA 30, 450–452	149n. 82
II,99,228: BA 30, 524	139n. 34
II,108,247: BA 30, 560	138n. 28
III,3,4: BA 30, 590	142n. 55
III,10,11: BA 30, 610	89n. 5
III,17,20: BA 30, 624	89n. 5
III,25,30: BA 30, 644	89n. 5
III,28,33: BA 30, 650–652	136n. 14
III,28,33: BA 30, 652	153n. 105
III,36,42: BA 30, 672–674	137n. 17
III,40,46: BA 30, 682	138n. 32
III,42,51: BA 30, 690	137n. 18
III,49,59: BA 30, 708	138n. 29
III,55,67: BA 30, 730	143n. 59

*Contra Secundinum*

3: CSEL 25/2, 908	111n. 44
4: CSEL 25/2, 910	111n. 26
5: CSEL 25/2, 911 ff.	111n. 45
5: CSEL 25/2, 911	109n. 25
5: CSEL 25/2, 912	109n. 28
7: CSEL 25/2, 915 f.	111n. 45

9: CSEL 25/2, 917 f.	111n. 49
23: CSEL 25/2, 941	115n. 84
24: CSEL 25/2, 942	111n. 49
26: CSEL 25/2, 947	111n. 47

*Contra sermonem Arrianorum*

7–8: CSEL 92, 56–58	263n. 338
7: CSEL 92, 58	263n. 338

*De agone Christiano*

4,4: BA 1, 378–380	111n. 50
7,7: BA 1, 384 f.	110n. 38
20,22: BA 1, 408	110n. 34

*De anima et eius origine*

I,1,1–2,2: CSEL 60, 303 f.	220n. 41
I,4,4–5,5: CSEL 60, 305 f.	221n. 43
I,6,6: CSEL 60, 307	221n. 49
I,8,9: CSEL 60, 309 f.	221n. 44
I,9,10: CSEL 60, 310	221n. 46
I,9,11: CSEL 60, 312	221n. 47
I,12,15: CSEL 60, 314 ff.	221n. 48,
	222n. 54
I,14,17: CSEL 60, 317	222n. 55; 56
I,14,18–21: CSEL 60, 318–322	222n. 57
I,14,22: CSEL 60, 322	222n. 56
I,15,24: CSEL 60, 323	220n. 42
I,15,25: CSEL 60, 323 f.	223n. 60
I,16,26–27: CSEL 60, 325 f.	222n. 56
II,3,5: CSEL 60, 338 f.	221n. 43
II,5,9: CSEL 60, 342 f.	221n. 43
II,9,13: CSEL 60, 346 f.	221n. 45
II,10,14: CSEL 60, 348	221n. 46
II,12,17: CSEL 60, 351	221n. 51
II,13,18: CSEL 60, 353	221n. 50
III,3,3: CSEL 60, 362 f.	221n. 43
III,7,9: CSEL 60, 367	221n. 53
III,9,12: CSEL 60, 369	221n. 51
III,10,13: CSEL 60, 370	222n. 54
III,13,19: CSEL 60, 374	221n. 46; 52
III,15,22: CSEL 60, 377 f.	222n. 54
IV,4,5: CSEL 60, 384 f.	222n. 59,
	223n. 60

- IV,11,16: *CSEL* 60, 395 222n. 58  
 IV,11,16: *CSEL* 60, 396 223n. 61  
 IV,18,28: *CSEL* 60, 407 f. 221n. 43
- De baptismo*
- I,1,2: *BA* 29, 58 137n. 25,  
 138n. 29  
 I,4,5: *BA* 29, 68 138n. 28  
 I,9,12: *BA* 29, 84–86 139n. 34  
 I,10,14: *BA* 29, 88 138n. 33  
 I,11,15: *BA* 29, 92 141n. 50  
 I,12,18: *BA* 29, 98 138n. 31  
 I,18,28: *BA* 29, 116 134n. 7  
 II,1,1: *BA* 29, 124 134n. 7  
 II,1,2: *BA* 29, 126 143n. 60  
 II,1,2: *BA* 29, 128 143n. 61  
 II,15,20: *BA* 29, 172–174 134n. 7  
 III,4,6: *BA* 29, 188 136n. 16  
 III,11,16: *BA* 29, 196–198 137n. 25,  
 138n. 29  
 III,13,18: *BA* 29, 200–202 139n. 39  
 III,16,21: *BA* 29, 210–212 139n. 34  
 III,19,25: *BA* 29, 220 138n. 29  
 IV,3,4: *BA* 29, 238–240 142n. 52,  
 153n. 110  
 IV,4,5: *BA* 29, 242 136n. 16  
 IV,9,13–10,14: *BA* 29, 266–268 143n. 57  
 IV,11,17: *BA* 29, 274 143n. 62  
 IV,12,18: *BA* 29, 276–278 134n. 7  
 IV,14,21: *BA* 29, 284 139n. 37  
 IV,17,24: *BA* 29, 294 138n. 31  
 IV,18,25: *BA* 29, 296–298 139n. 39  
 IV,20,27: *BA* 29, 302 139n. 39  
 IV,21,28: *BA* 29, 304–306 138n. 33  
 IV,22,29: *BA* 29, 308–310 142n. 54  
 IV,24,31–25,32: *BA* 29, 314–316 140n. 43  
 V,8,9: *BA* 29, 338 138n. 32  
 V,11,13: *BA* 29, 346–348 138n. 27  
 V,20,28: *BA* 29, 376 137n. 23
- V,21,29: *BA* 29, 380 139n. 37  
 V,27,38: *BA* 29, 394–396 142n. 52; 53,  
 144n. 66,  
 153n. 111  
 V,28,39: *BA* 29, 400 141n. 48  
 VI,4,6: *BA* 29, 412 144n. 65  
 VI,14,23: *BA* 29, 436 144n. 65  
 VI,15,25: *BA* 29, 438 138n. 30  
 VI,32,62: *BA* 29, 474 141n. 47  
 VII,6,11: *BA* 29, 514 139n. 42  
 VII,19,37: *BA* 29, 528–530 139n. 37  
 VII,41,81: *BA* 29, 548–550 138n. 31
- De beata vita*
- 1,4: *BA* 4/1, 56–58 7n. 3,  
 95n. 29  
 2,10: *CCL* 29, 70 f. 9n. 8  
 2,11: *CCL* 29, 71 f. 9n. 9  
 3,19–21: *CCL* 29, 75–77 9n. 10  
 4,24: *CCL* 29, 78, 21 f. 9n. 11  
 4,33–34: *CCL* 29, 83 f. 10n. 12; 13  
 4,35: *CCL* 29, 84 10n. 14
- De bono coniugali*
- 1,1: *BA* 2, 22 et *passim* 124n. 148
- De bono viduitatis*
- 16,20: *CSEL* 41, 328 258n. 308;  
 309  
 17,21: *CSEL* 41, 329 f. 258n. 310;  
 311; 312
- De catechizandis rudibus*
- 4,7,6: *CCL* 46, 127 115n. 84  
 22,39,3: *CCL* 46, 163 f. 114n. 70  
 25,47,7: *CCL* 46, 170 107n. 13  
 27,55,12: *CCL* 46, 177 113n. 67
- De civitate Dei*
- I,35: *CCL* 47, 34 268n. 359,  
 269n. 362  
 V,1–7: *CCL* 47, 128–135 272n. 383  
 V,8: *CCL* 47, 135 f. 272n. 384



*De civitate Dei (cont.)*

- V,9: *CCL* 47, 136–138 272n. 385;  
386  
V,9: *CCL* 47, 138f. 273n. 387;  
389; 390;  
391  
V,9: *CCL* 47, 140 273n. 392  
V,10: *CCL* 47, 140 273n. 393  
V,10: *CCL* 47, 141 273n. 394  
VIII,4: *CCL* 47, 220 268n. 360  
IX,8–9: *CCL* 47, 256ff. 274n. 398  
IX,15: *CCL* 47, 262f. 274n. 397  
IX,17: *CCL* 47, 265f. 7n. 3  
IX,21: *CCL* 47, 268 277n. 417  
X,9–11: *CCL* 47, 281–286 268n. 356  
X,14: *CCL* 47, 288 7n. 3  
X,16: *CCL* 47, 289 7f.n. 3  
X,22: *CCL* 47, 296 274n. 395  
X,23: *CCL* 47, 296 268n. 356  
X,30: *CCL* 47, 307f. 268n. 356  
X,32: *CCL* 48, 313f. 267n. 354,  
268n. 359  
XI,1: *CCL* 48, 321f. 269n. 362  
XI,9–21: *CCL* 48, 328–340 269n. 366  
XI,17: *CCL* 48, 336f. 269n. 367  
XI,18: *CCL* 48, 337 278n. 424  
XI,23: *CCL* 48, 342 278n. 423  
XI,33: *CCL* 48, 352f. 269n. 366  
XII,1: *CCL* 48, 355 270n. 369,  
276n. 413  
XII,1–2: *CCL* 48, 356f. 275n. 412  
XII,2: *CCL* 48, 357 270n. 371  
XII,5: *CCL* 48, 359 270n. 372  
XII,6–7: *CCL* 48, 360–362 270n. 370  
XII,6: *CCL* 48, 359 269n. 368  
XII,6: *CCL* 48, 360 275n. 412  
XII,8: *CCL* 48, 362 270n. 374  
XII,9: *CCL* 48, 363 276n. 414  
XII,21: *CCL* 48, 378 268n. 356  
XIII,3: *CCL* 48, 387 274n. 396  
XIII,5: *CCL* 48, 388 275n. 408  
XIII,14: *CCL* 48, 395f. 271n. 381,  
274n. 396  
XIII,19: *CCL* 48, 402 268n. 356  
XIII,21: *CCL* 48, 404 272n. 382  
XIII,23: *CCL* 48, 406f. 277n. 417  
XIV,1: *CCL* 48, 414 274n. 396,  
277n. 418  
XIV,3: *CCL* 48, 417f. 271n. 377  
XIV,5–6: *CCL* 48, 420f. 271n. 377  
XIV,7: *CCL* 48, 422 269n. 365  
XIV,11: *CCL* 48, 431f. 271n. 375  
XIV,13: *CCL* 48, 434f. 269n. 364,  
271n. 376  
XIV,15: *CCL* 48, 437 274n. 396  
XIV,24: *CCL* 48, 448 271n. 378  
XIV,26: *CCL* 48, 450 274n. 403,  
277n. 417  
XIV,27: *CCL* 48, 451 275n. 410,  
276n. 415  
XIV,28: *CCL* 48, 451 269n. 363,  
277n. 416  
XV,1: *CCL* 48, 453 277n. 419  
XV,2: *CCL* 48, 455 274n. 401  
XV,6: *CCL* 48, 459 274n. 402  
XV,21: *CCL* 48, 487 275n. 411  
XV,23: *CCL* 48, 490f. 274n. 399  
XVI,27: *CCL* 48, 531f. 274n. 396,  
275n. 409  
XVI,35: *CCL* 48, 540 275n. 409  
XVIII,1: *CCL* 48, 592 267n. 354  
XVIII,48: *CCL* 48, 647 277n. 420  
XIX,13: *CCL* 48, 679f. 269n. 367  
XIX,22: *CCL* 48, 690 268n. 356  
XIX,28: *CCL* 48, 698f. 271n. 380  
XXI,5: *CCL* 48, 766 277n. 421  
XXI,15: *CCL* 48, 781 274n. 400  
XXI,16: *CCL* 48, 782f. 274n. 404  
XXI,17: *CCL* 48, 783 277n. 422  
XXI,24: *CCL* 48, 792 277n. 418  
XXII,1: *CCL* 48, 806f. 271n. 375  
XXII,2: *CCL* 48, 807 275n. 406  
XXII,3: *CCL* 48, 809 268n. 356  
XXII,12: *CCL* 48, 833 268n. 356  
XXII,23: *CCL* 48, 845f. 271n. 379  
XXII,24: *CCL* 48, 847f. 275n. 405  
XXII,27: *CCL* 48, 854f. 268n. 356  
XXII,30: *CCL* 48, 865 275n. 407

*De consensu evangelistarum*

I,23,35: CSEL 43, 34f.	100n. 57
II,3,6: CSEL 43, 87	109n. 29
II,4,11: CSEL 43, 93	110n. 37
IV,10,17: CSEL 43, 412	111n. 43
IV,10,19: CSEL 43, 413	110n. 42
IV,10,20: CSEL 43, 417	110n. 39

*De correptione et gratia*

4,6: CSEL 92, 223	281n. 443
6,9: CSEL 92, 227	281n. 446
6,10: CSEL 92, 227f.	281n. 444
7,11: CSEL 92, 231	281n. 447
7,13–16: CSEL 92, 233–237	281n. 448
8,17: CSEL 92, 238	282n. 449
8,18: CSEL 92, 239	285n. 460
9,25: CSEL 92, 249	285n. 462
10,26: CSEL 92, 249f.	282n. 450
11,31–32: CSEL 92, 255–259	282n. 451
11,31: CSEL 92, 256f.	283n. 453
12,33: CSEL 92, 259	283n. 452
12,34: CSEL 92, 259f.	283n. 455
12,38–13,39: CSEL 92, 265–267	284n. 456
13,39–40: CSEL 92, 267–269	283n. 454
13,42: CSEL 92, 271	280n. 434
14,43: CSEL 92, 271f.	284n. 457,
	285n. 462
14,44–45: CSEL 92, 272f.	284n. 459
14,44: CSEL 92, 272	284n. 458
14,45: CSEL 92, 273	284n. 456
15,47: CSEL 92, 277f.	285n. 461
16,48–49: CSEL 92, 278f.	285n. 463

*De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*

I,1,1: CCL 44, 7f.	72n. 9
I,1,7: CCL 44, 12	74n. 17
I,1,9: CCL 44, 14	72n. 9
I,1,10: CCL 44, 15	73n. 12
I,1,11: CCL 44, 15f.	73n. 10
I,1,14: CCL 44, 17f.	74n. 13

I,1,16: CCL 44, 20	74n. 14
I,1,17: CCL 44, 22	74n. 15
I,1,17: CCL 44, 23	74n. 16
I,2,2: CCL 44, 24f.	75n. 19
I,2,3: CCL 44, 27	75n. 20
I,2,5: CCL 44, 29, 145–147	76n. 21
I,2,6: CCL 44, 31	77n. 23
I,2,7: CCL 44, 31f.	76n. 22
I,2,9: CCL 44, 34	79n. 31
I,2,10: CCL 44, 34f.	78n. 26
I,2,12: CCL 44, 37	78n. 27
I,2,13: CCL 44, 37f.	78n. 24,
	80n. 32; 33
I,2,14: CCL 44, 38f.	80n. 34
I,2,16–17: CCL 44, 41–43	80n. 35,
	81n. 36
I,2,18: CCL 44, 45f.	81n. 37
I,2,18: CCL 44, 47	81n. 38
I,2,21: CCL 44, 53f.	79n. 28; 29;
	31, 149n. 83
I,2,21: CCL 44, 53, 737	82n. 40
I,2,22: CCL 44, 56	81n. 39
II,1,5: CCL 44, 66	72n. 7

*De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*

2–4: CCL 44A, 11–13	28n. 74
8: CCL 44A, 15	28n. 75
17: CCL 44A, 22	28n. 77
24: CCL 44A, 29f.	28n. 76
27: CCL 44A, 33f.	28n. 78
28: CCL 44A, 35	28n. 73
30: CCL 44A, 40	29n. 81
31,1: CCL 44A, 42	29n. 83
40: CCL 44A, 62	29n. 80
51,2: CCL 44A, 79f.	17n. 7
51,4: CCL 44A, 81f.	16n. 6
53,1–2: CCL 44A, 87–90	28n. 76
61: CCL 44A, 129f.	29n. 82
66,1: CCL 44A, 151f.	55n. 92
66,3: CCL 44A, 154f.	55n. 93
66,5–6: CCL 44A, 155–162	56n. 95
66,6: CCL 44A, 158f.	55n. 94
67,2: CCL 44A, 166	47n. 55
67,4: CCL 44A, 167f.	58n. 102

*De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*

(cont.)

68,2: CCL 44A, 176	57n. 98
68,3: CCL 44A, 177 f.	56n. 96, 57n. 99, 58n. 101
68,4: CCL 44A, 179 f.	54n. 91, 58n. 103
68,5: CCL 44A, 181	59n. 104
76: CCL 44A, 218–221	57n. 97

*De doctrina Christiana*

I,4,4: CCL 32, 8	114n. 72
III,33,46: CCL 32, 105 f.	50n. 70

*De dono perseverantiae*

1,1: BA 24, 600–602	291n. 494
2,2: BA 24, 602–604	290n. 492
6,10: BA 24, 620	291n. 494
8,16: BA 24, 632	291n. 497
8,18: BA 24, 634	291n. 498
8,19: BA 24, 636	291n. 497
9,21: BA 24, 640–642	291n. 493
9,22: BA 24, 642	291n. 495
11,25: BA 24, 652–654	291n. 496
12,28–29: BA 24, 662–664	291n. 499
12,31: BA 24, 670	291n. 499
14,35: BA 24, 680–682	291n. 493
14,35: BA 24, 684	292n. 505
14,36: BA 24, 686	291n. 500
14,37: BA 24, 688–690	292n. 505
16,41: BA 24, 698	291n. 500
17,45–46: BA 24, 710–712	290n. 492
18,47: BA 24, 718	291n. 493
20,52–53: BA 24, 728–730	291n. 501
20,53: BA 24, 730	97n. 43, 167n. 4
22,57: BA 24, 740	293n. 507
22,58–59: BA 24, 740–742	292n. 502
22,59: BA 24, 742–744	292n. 503
22,61: BA 24, 746	292n. 504, 293n. 507

23,63–65: BA 24, 750–756	292n. 506
24,67: BA 24, 760–762	290n. 486

*De duabus animabus*

10,14: BA 17, 90	36n. 4
11,15: BA 17, 92	326n. 148
13,19–20: BA 17, 104–106	35n. 2, 36n. 3; 5
14,23: BA 17, 112	35n. 1

*De fide et symbolo*

4,6: BA 9 <sup>2</sup> , 32	47n. 55
9,16: BA 9 <sup>2</sup> , 48	47n. 56
9,19: BA 9 <sup>2</sup> , 56–60	47n. 57

*De Genesi ad litteram*

I,4,9–5,10: BA 48, 90–94	242n. 209
I,15,29: BA 48, 120	101n. 60
III,20,30: BA 48, 260	241n. 198
IV,2,2–3: BA 48, 280–282	112n. 52
IV,3,7–IV,4,8: BA 48, 288–292	112n. 52
IV,7,14: BA 48, 298	112n. 52
IV,9,16–17: BA 48, 300	122n. 134; 135
IV,9,19: BA 48, 302	120n. 128
IV,12,23: BA 48, 310	121n. 133
IV,13,24: BA 48, 312	122n. 136
V,5,16: BA 48, 396	101n. 60
V,20,41: BA 48, 430–432	120n. 129
VI,5,7: BA 48, 454	120n. 129
VI,6,9–11: BA 48, 456–458	120n. 129
VI,8,13: BA 48, 464	101n. 60
VI,9,14: BA 48, 464	120n. 128, 122n. 137
VI,9,15: BA 48, 466	122n. 138, 123n. 140
VI,9,16: BA 48, 466–468	122n. 139
VI,10,17: BA 48, 468	120n. 129
VI,11,19: BA 48, 472–474	120n. 128
VI,12,21: BA 48, 476	241n. 198

VI,15,26–16,27: BA 48, 484–486  
 119n. 125  
 VI,17,28: BA 48, 488 119n. 124;  
 126  
 VI,18,29: BA 48, 490 119n. 125  
 VI,27,38: BA 48, 504 241n. 206,  
 245n. 227  
 VII,4,6: BA 48, 516 100n. 57  
 VII,24,35–28,43: BA 48, 558–570  
 123n. 141  
 VIII,9,18: BA 49, 38 118n. 115  
 VIII,11,24: BA 49, 46–48 115n. 83  
 VIII,12,25: BA 49, 48 121n. 131  
 VIII,12,25–26: BA 49, 48–50  
 121n. 130  
 VIII,12,27: BA 49, 50 121n. 132  
 VIII,20,39: BA 49, 68 101n. 60  
 VIII,21,40–22,43: BA 49, 70–74  
 118n. 116  
 VIII,23,44: BA 49, 74–76  
 118n. 115  
 VIII,23,44: BA 49, 76 118n. 118  
 VIII,24,45: BA 49, 78 118n. 114; 117  
 VIII,26,48: BA 49, 82 118n. 119  
 VIII,27,49: BA 49, 84 118n. 120  
 IX,3,6: BA 49, 96–98 123n. 142;  
 143; 145  
 IX,10,17: BA 49, 112 123n. 142  
 IX,10,18: BA 49, 114 123n. 142,  
 123n. 144;  
 145  
 IX,11,19: BA 49, 116 123n. 141,  
 125n. 152  
 IX,15,28: BA 49, 130–132 118n. 114; 121  
 IX,17,32: BA 49, 138–140 119n. 122,  
 120n. 129  
 IX,18,33–34: BA 49, 140–142  
 119n. 123,  
 120n. 127  
 X,1,1–2: BA 49, 146–148 216n. 10  
 X,2,3: BA 49, 150–152 216n. 14  
 X,3,4: BA 49, 154 216n. 12  
 X,4,7: BA 49, 158 216n. 13  
 X,11,19: BA 49, 176–178 217n. 17  
 X,12,20–21: BA 49, 178–180  
 217n. 18

X,14,25: BA 49, 188 217n. 16  
 X,15,26: BA 49, 190 217n. 19  
 X,16,28: BA 49, 192 217n. 20  
 X,18,32: BA 49, 200–202 217n. 21  
 X,18,33: BA 49, 202 217n. 22  
 X,20,36: BA 49, 210 217n. 23  
 X,21,37: BA 49, 212 217n. 24  
 X,23,39: BA 49, 214 217n. 15  
 X,25,41: BA 49, 220 215n. 6

*De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*  
 3–4: CSEL 28/1, 464–468

57n. 100  
 15: CSEL 28/1, 495 57n. 100  
 16: CSEL 28/1, 497–499 49n. 64

*De Genesi contra Manichaeos*

I,2,4: CSEL 91, 71 25n. 55  
 I,16,26: CSEL 91, 93 26n. 64  
 I,17,28: CSEL 91, 95 f. 17n. 7  
 I,18,29: CSEL 91, 96 f. 26n. 64,  
 27n. 69  
 I,19,30: CSEL 91, 97 f. 27n. 66  
 I,20,31: CSEL 91, 98 27n. 65  
 I,22,34: CSEL 91, 102 28n. 71  
 I,22,34: CSEL 91, 103 f. 27n. 70  
 I,25,43: CSEL 91, 113 18n. 12,  
 27n. 70  
 II,3,5: CSEL 91, 123 27n. 68  
 II,14,21: CSEL 91, 142 f. 26n. 58; 59  
 II,15,22: CSEL 91, 143 f. 26n. 61; 63  
 II,16,24: CSEL 91, 146 f. 27n. 67  
 II,17,25: CSEL 91, 147 26n. 62  
 II,28,42: CSEL 91, 170 26n. 60  
 II,39,43: CSEL 91, 171 f. 25n. 56

*De gestis Pelagii*

1,2: BA 21, 434 196n. 173  
 1,3: BA 21, 436–438 196n. 174  
 3,5: BA 21, 442 196n. 177  
 3,7–8: BA 21, 448 198n. 189  
 3,9–10: BA 21, 450–452 199n. 190  
 6–7,20: BA 21, 476–478 198n. 188  
 11,23: BA 21, 484 160n. 5  
 13,29: BA 21, 496–498 196n. 176

*De gestis Pelagii (cont.)*

14,30: BA 21, 498–500	196n. 178, 197n. 179
14,31: BA 21, 500–504	197n. 180
14,32: BA 21, 504–508	197n. 181
14,33: BA 21, 508–510	197n. 182, 198n. 188
14,34–36: BA 21, 510–518	197n. 183
17,40: BA 21, 524–526	198n. 184
18,42–19,43: BA 21, 528–530	198n. 185
20,45: BA 21, 532	195n. 169
22,46: BA 21, 532	167n. 1
23,47: BA 21, 534	167n. 2, 198n. 187
26,51–29,53: BA 21, 540–546	167n. 3
27–28,52: BA 21, 542–544	167n. 3
30,54: BA 21, 546	195n. 169
30,55: BA 21, 550	196n. 175
31,56: BA 21, 554	195n. 169
33,57–58: BA 21, 556–558	195n. 169
35,61: BA 21, 564–566	198n. 186
35,62–65: BA 21, 566–576	196n. 171

*De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*

I,2,2: BA 22, 54–56	200n. 192, 201n. 198
I,3,4: BA 22, 58	200n. 193
I,4,5: BA 22, 60	200n. 194
I,5,6: BA 22, 62–64	201n. 201
I,7,8: BA 22, 68	201n. 199
I,10,11: BA 22, 74–76	201n. 200, 203n. 207
I,12,13: BA 22, 78–80	203n. 208; 209
I,13,14: BA 22, 80	202n. 205
I,13,14: BA 22, 84	202n. 206, 204n. 211
I,16,17: BA 22, 88	200n. 194
I,17,18: BA 22, 88–90	200n. 195
I,20,21–21,22: BA 22, 94–96	201n. 202

I,22,24: BA 22, 98–100	201n. 196
I,23,24: BA 22, 100–102	202n. 203
I,24,25: BA 22, 104	202n. 204
I,27,28–28,29: BA 22, 110–112	201n. 197
I,31,33: BA 22, 116–118	201n. 198
I,31,34: BA 22, 118–120	201n. 197
I,35,38: BA 22, 126	168n. 5, 201n. 198
I,41,45: BA 22, 136–138	201n. 198
I,47,52: BA 22, 148–150	201n. 201
II,2,2: BA 22, 160	204n. 212
II,3,3: BA 22, 162	204n. 214
II,5,5–6,6: BA 22, 166–168	205n. 215
II,10,11–11,12: BA 22, 174–178	205n. 216
II,11,12: BA 22, 176–178	160n. 5
II,13,14: BA 22, 180	205n. 218
II,15,16: BA 22, 186	205n. 219
II,16,17: BA 22, 188	205n. 217
II,21,23: BA 22, 198	205n. 221
II,21,24: BA 22, 200	205n. 220
II,23,26: BA 22, 204	204n. 213
II,24,28: BA 22, 212	206n. 223
II,29,34: BA 22, 228–230	206n. 222; 224
II,30,35–31,36: BA 22, 232–234	207n. 226; 227
II,32,37: BA 22, 238	207n. 230
II,33,38: BA 22, 240	207n. 231
II,37,42: BA 22, 250	207n. 229, 208n. 232
II,38,43: BA 22, 252–254	207n. 228, 208n. 233
II,40,45: BA 22, 256	208n. 235
II,41,47: BA 22, 264–266	206n. 225, 208n. 234

*De gratia et libero arbitrio*

1,1: BA 24, 90	279n. 427
2,2–3,5: BA 24, 92–104	279n. 428
4,6–7: BA 24, 104–108	279n. 429

- 4,8: *BA* 24, 110 279n. 430
- 5,12–6,13: *BA* 24, 118–120 279n. 431
- 6,15: *BA* 24, 124 280n. 440
- 8,19–20: *BA* 24, 130–134 280n. 439
- 9,21: *BA* 24, 134–136 280n. 439
- 13,25: *BA* 24, 146–148 281n. 441
- 14,28: *BA* 24, 150–152 280n. 433
- 15,31: *BA* 24, 158–160 280n. 434;  
438
- 16,32: *BA* 24, 162–164 279n. 432
- 17,34: *BA* 24, 168 280n. 435
- 17,37: *BA* 24, 174 280n. 435
- 21,42: *BA* 24, 190–194 280n. 437
- 21,43: *BA* 24, 196 280n. 436
- 23,45: *BA* 24, 202 280n. 437
- De gratia Novi Testamenti*
- 1,2: *CSEL* 44, 156 228n. 94
- 2,3: *CSEL* 44, 156 f. 228n. 95
- 2,5: *CSEL* 44, 158 229n. 96
- 3,6: *CSEL* 44, 158 229n. 97,  
231n. 112
- 3,9–4,10: *CSEL* 44, 161 f. 229n. 98
- 4,11: *CSEL* 44, 162 229n. 102
- 4,12: *CSEL* 44, 163 229n. 100
- 6,18: *CSEL* 44, 168 229n. 101
- 9,24: *CSEL* 44, 175 231n. 111
- 10,26: *CSEL* 44, 176 f. 230n. 109
- 17,44–18,45: *CSEL* 44, 192 f. 230n. 105
- 18,45: *CSEL* 44, 193 229n. 103
- 19,48: *CSEL* 44, 195 f. 230n. 107
- 20,51: *CSEL* 44, 198 230n. 106
- 21,53: *CSEL* 44, 199 230n. 104;  
110
- 29,70: *CSEL* 44, 217 f. 231n. 114
- 31,74: *CSEL* 44, 221 231n. 113
- 36,82: *CSEL* 44, 230 229n. 99
- 37,83: *CSEL* 44, 231 231n. 117
- 37,84: *CSEL* 44, 232 f. 231n. 115
- 37,85: *CSEL* 44, 234 231n. 116
- De haeresibus*
- 87,2–7: *CCL* 46, 340–342 165n. 22
- De libero arbitrio*
- I,1,1,1: *CCL* 29, 211 19n. 17
- I,1,1,3: *CCL* 29, 211 19n. 18
- I,3,6,15–16: *CCL* 29, 214 20n. 19
- I,3,8,20: *CCL* 29, 215 20n. 20
- I,4,10,27: *CCL* 29, 216 20n. 22
- I,4,10,28: *CCL* 29, 216 20n. 21; 22
- I,4,10,31: *CCL* 29, 217 20n. 21; 24
- I,6,15,51: *CCL* 29, 220 20n. 26
- I,8,18,64: *CCL* 29, 223 20n. 23
- I,10,20,71: *CCL* 29, 224 20n. 25
- I,11,21,76–I,11,22,78: *CCL* 29, 225 f.  
21n. 28
- I,12,24,80–I,12,25,82: *CCL* 29, 226 f.  
21n. 29
- I,12,25,82–83: *CCL* 29, 227  
21n. 30
- I,12,26,86: *CCL* 29, 228 22n. 31
- I,13,27,90: *CCL* 29, 228 f. 22n. 33
- I,13,28,95: *CCL* 29, 230 22n. 32
- I,13,29,97–98: *CCL* 29, 231  
22n. 34
- I,14,30,101: *CCL* 29, 231 22n. 35
- I,15,31,103–104: *CCL* 29, 232  
23n. 36
- I,16,34,115–I,16,35,116: *CCL* 29, 234 f.  
23n. 37
- II,18,49,189: *CCL* 29, 270  
39n. 19
- II,19,52,196: *CCL* 29, 272 39n. 20
- II,20,54,201–205: *CCL* 29, 272 f.  
39n. 21
- III,1,2,8–9: *CCL* 29, 275 39n. 22
- III,3,7,26: *CCL* 29, 279 44n. 40
- III,3,7,27: *CCL* 29, 279 42n. 32,  
43n. 38
- III,3,7,28–29: *CCL* 29, 279  
42n. 34
- III,3,8,32–33: *CCL* 29, 280  
43n. 39
- III,4,9,37–39: *CCL* 29, 281  
42n. 34
- III,6,18,63: *CCL* 29, 285 f.  
42n. 34
- III,9,25,91–III,9,26,95: *CCL* 29, 290 f.  
42n. 35

*De libero arbitrio (cont.)*

- III,11,32,113: *CCL* 29, 294 42n. 35  
 III,11,43,151–152: *CCL* 29, 301  
 43n. 36  
 III,16,45,155: *CCL* 29, 302  
 43n. 37  
 III,17,49,168: *CCL* 29, 304  
 42n. 33  
 III,18,50,170–171: *CCL* 29, 304  
 188n. 111  
 III,18,51,172–III,18,52,179: *CCL* 29,  
 305 f.  
 40n. 25  
 III,18,52,177: *CCL* 29, 305  
 39n. 23  
 III,19,53,181–182: *CCL* 29, 306  
 40n. 27  
 III,19,54,184–185: *CCL* 29, 306 f.  
 40n. 26  
 III,20,55,187: *CCL* 29, 307  
 41n. 29  
 III,20,56,188–III,20,58,199: *CCL* 29,  
 307–309  
 42n. 31,  
 214n. 1  
 III,22,64,220: *CCL* 29, 313  
 40n. 24,  
 41n. 28  
 III,22,65,223: *CCL* 29, 314  
 41n. 30  
 III,23,68,229: *CCL* 29, 315  
 45n. 46  
 III,23,68,231: *CCL* 29, 315  
 45n. 46  
 III,24,71,240–III,24,72,246: *CCL* 29,  
 317 f.  
 45n. 45  
 III,24,71,242: *CCL* 29, 317  
 45n. 46  
 III,25,74,255: *CCL* 29, 319  
 44n. 42; 44  
 III,25,75,259: *CCL* 29, 320  
 44n. 41; 43

*De magistro*

- 14,45–46: *CCL* 29, 202 f. 149n. 84

*De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de  
moribus Manichaeorum*

- I,3,4: *CSEL* 90, 6 23n. 38  
 I,5,7: *CSEL* 90, 9 23n. 39  
 I,5,8: *CSEL* 90, 11 23n. 40  
 I,6,9–10: *CSEL* 90, 12 f. 23n. 41  
 I,11,18: *CSEL* 90, 21 32n. 43  
 I,13,22–23: *CSEL* 90, 26 f.  
 24n. 44; 45  
 I,14,24: *CSEL* 90, 29 23n. 42  
 I,15,25: *CSEL* 90, 29 24n. 46  
 I,16,29: *CSEL* 90, 34 24n. 44; 46  
 I,19,36: *CSEL* 90, 40 24n. 48  
 I,22,40: *CSEL* 90, 45 24n. 47  
 I,22,41: *CSEL* 90, 46 24n. 49  
 I,25,47: *CSEL* 90, 52 25n. 51  
 I,26,48–51: *CSEL* 90, 53–55  
 24n. 50  
 I,26,51: *CSEL* 90, 55 25n. 52  
 I,30,64: *CSEL* 90, 67 24n. 49

*De musica*

- VI,5,8–10: *BA* 7, 376–382  
 214n. 3

*De natura boni*

- 1: *CSEL* 25/2, 855 109n. 26  
 22: *CSEL* 25/2, 864 112n. 51  
 24: *CSEL* 25/2, 866 109n. 26  
 27: *CSEL* 25/2, 868 109n. 26  
 42: *CSEL* 25/2, 876–879  
 111n. 49; 50

*De natura et gratia*

- 3,3: *CSEL* 60, 235 189n. 118  
 7,8: *CSEL* 60, 237 188n. 109  
 8,9: *CSEL* 60, 238 190n. 133  
 9,10: *CSEL* 60, 238 f. 188n. 116,  
 190n. 125  
 11,12: *CSEL* 60, 240 188n. 108,  
 190n. 135  
 15,16: *CSEL* 60, 242 f. 190n. 129  
 17,19: *CSEL* 60, 245 188n. 117,  
 190n. 132  
 19,21: *CSEL* 60, 246 188n. 115  
 20,22: *CSEL* 60, 247 f. 189n. 123

- 22,24–23,25: *CSEL* 60, 249 ff.  
 190n. 126  
 23,25: *CSEL* 60, 251 189n. 122,  
 190n. 130  
 25,28: *CSEL* 60, 254 190n. 127  
 30,34: *CSEL* 60, 258 188n. 110,  
 189n. 122  
 34,39: *CSEL* 60, 261 f. 189n. 121;  
 124  
 38,45: *CSEL* 60, 266 f. 190n. 136  
 44,51: *CSEL* 60, 271 190n. 137  
 45,53: *CSEL* 60, 271 f. 188n. 112  
 49,57: *CSEL* 60, 275 188n. 113,  
 189n. 119  
 50,58: *CSEL* 60, 275 190n. 131  
 51,59: *CSEL* 60, 276 188n. 114  
 53,61: *CSEL* 60, 278 190n. 134  
 53,62: *CSEL* 60, 278 f. 188n. 108,  
 189n. 120  
 55,65: *CSEL* 60, 282 190n. 128  
 57,67: *CSEL* 60, 283 f. 190n. 139  
 59,69: *CSEL* 60, 285 190n. 138  
 67,80: *CSEL* 60, 293 188n. 111
- De nuptiis et concupiscentia*  
 I,1,1: *BA* 23, 54 299n. 6  
 I,6,7: *BA* 23, 68–70 299n. 7; 10  
 I,20,22: *BA* 23, 106 299n. 12  
 I,21,23: *BA* 23, 106–108 299n. 11  
 I,22,24: *BA* 23, 108 299n. 10  
 I,23,25: *BA* 23, 112 300n. 14  
 I,23,26: *BA* 23, 112 299n. 12  
 I,23,26–24,27: *BA* 23, 112–116  
 301n. 16  
 I,25,28: *BA* 23, 116–118 300n. 13  
 I,27,30: *BA* 23, 120–122 299n. 8  
 I,28,31: *BA* 23, 124 302n. 18  
 I,29,31: *BA* 23, 124 302n. 19  
 I,29,32: *BA* 23, 124–126 302n. 20  
 I,30,33: *BA* 23, 128 303n. 23  
 I,30,34: *BA* 23, 128–130 302n. 22  
 I,31,35: *BA* 23, 130–132 302n. 21  
 I,32,37: *BA* 23, 134–136 300n. 15  
 I,33,38: *BA* 23, 136 301n. 17  
 II,1,1: *BA* 23, 146 303n. 24  
 II,3,7: *BA* 23, 158 303n. 25
- II,3,8: *BA* 23, 160 303n. 26  
 II,3,9: *BA* 23, 162 305n. 44,  
 306n. 46  
 II,4,11: *BA* 23, 168 303n. 27,  
 305n. 41  
 II,4,12–13: *BA* 23, 170–172  
 304n. 28  
 II,5,14: *BA* 23, 172 304n. 36  
 II,5,15: *BA* 23, 174–176 304n. 32; 37  
 II,5,15: *BA* 23, 176–178 305n. 43  
 II,6,16–7,18: *BA* 23, 180–182  
 305n. 38  
 II,7,17: *BA* 23, 182 299n. 9,  
 304n. 29,  
 305n. 39  
 II,9,22: *BA* 23, 192–194 305n. 38  
 II,10,23: *BA* 23, 194–196 304n. 29  
 II,12,25: *BA* 23, 200 305n. 38; 42  
 II,19,34: *BA* 23, 220–222 304n. 30  
 II,20,35: *BA* 23, 224 305n. 40  
 II,21,36: *BA* 23, 226 305n. 40  
 II,23,28: *BA* 23, 230–232  
 306n. 46  
 II,26,41: *BA* 23, 234 304n. 31  
 II,26,42: *BA* 23, 236–238  
 304n. 36  
 II,27,44: *BA* 23, 242 304n. 33  
 II,27,45: *BA* 23, 244 304n. 34  
 II,27,46: *BA* 23, 248 304n. 37  
 II,29,49: *BA* 23, 256 304n. 35  
 II,29,51: *BA* 23, 262–264 305n. 43  
 II,33,55: *BA* 23, 272–274 305n. 40  
 II,34,57: *BA* 23, 280 305n. 45  
 II,35,60: *BA* 23, 286–288  
 306n. 47
- De opere monachorum*  
 3,4: *BA* 3, 324 113n. 64  
 7,8: *BA* 3, 338 113n. 64  
 10,11: *BA* 3, 344–346 113n. 64
- De ordine*  
 I,6,15: *CCL* 29, 96 f. 10n. 18  
 I,7,17: *CCL* 29, 97, 10 f. 10n. 17  
 I,7,18: *CCL* 29, 98 11n. 21  
 I,7,19: *CCL* 29, 98 11n. 23



*De ordine (cont.)*

I,8,26: <i>CCL</i> 29, 102,114	10n. 16
I,10,28: <i>CCL</i> 29, 103,13 f.	10n. 17
I,10,29: <i>CCL</i> 29, 103	11n. 24
II,1,2: <i>CCL</i> 29, 107	11n. 24
II,2,4: <i>CCL</i> 29, 108	12n. 29
II,4,12: <i>CCL</i> 29, 114	11n. 20
II,4-5,13: <i>CCL</i> 29, 114 f.	10n. 19
II,5,14: <i>CCL</i> 29, 115,13	10n. 15
II,7,20: <i>CCL</i> 29, 118	12n. 28
II,7,22: <i>CCL</i> 29, 118 f.	11n. 23
II,7,23: <i>CCL</i> 29, 119 f.	11n. 22
II,8,25: <i>CCL</i> 29, 121	12n. 26
II,15,43-16,44: <i>CCL</i> 29, 130 f.	12n. 27
II,16,44: <i>CCL</i> 29, 131,15 f.	12n. 25
II,18,47-19,51: <i>CCL</i> 29, 132-135	12n. 30

*De patientia*

17,14: <i>CSEL</i> 41, 678	259n. 320
20,17: <i>CSEL</i> 41, 682	259n. 321
22,19: <i>CSEL</i> 41, 684	259n. 322
23,20: <i>CSEL</i> 41, 685	259n. 320
25,22: <i>CSEL</i> 41, 686 f.	259n. 319

*De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum*

I,2,2: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 3	172n. 27
I,2,2: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 4	173n. 31
I,4,4: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 6	173n. 33
I,9,9: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 10 f.	173n. 29,
	174n. 35; 37,
	175n. 40,
	177n. 50
I,9,10: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 11	175n. 39
I,9,10-10,11: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 12	174n. 38
I,10,11: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 12	174n. 36
I,11,13: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 13 f.	173n. 32
I,13,17: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 17	175n. 40
I,16,21: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 20	176n. 46
I,19,24: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 23 f.	176n. 46
I,20,28: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 27	176n. 46
I,21,29-30: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 27-29	180n. 74
I,22,31: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 29 ff.	179n. 64

I,28,55: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 54 f.	176n. 44;
	45, 177n. 47
I,28,56-29,57: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 55-57	175n. 43
I,28,56: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 55	178n. 58
I,29,57: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 56	175n. 41
I,34,63: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 63 f.	177n. 48
I,34,63-64: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 64	172n. 26
I,34,64: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 64 f.	177n. 47; 50
II,2,2: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 72	178n. 60
II,4,4: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 73 f.	178n. 56,
	179n. 61
II,5,5: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 75 f.	179n. 62
II,5,6: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 76 f.	179n. 63,
	180n. 72
II,6,7: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 77	179n. 65
II,8,10: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 81 f.	179n. 66
II,17,26: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 99	180n. 71; 73
II,17,27: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 100	179n. 67
II,18,28: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 100	179n. 68
II,18,30: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 101	180n. 69
II,18,31: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 102	180n. 70
II,18,31-32: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 102 f.	180n. 74
II,19,32-33: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 103 f.	181n. 75
II,28,46: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 117	177n. 53
II,31,51: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 122	175n. 42
II,33,53: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 123	173n. 30
II,36,59: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 127 f.	178n. 59,
	215n. 9
III,1,1: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 129	167n. 2
III,3,5: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 132	177n. 51; 52
III,4,7: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 133 f.	176n. 46
III,6,12: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 139	177n. 49
III,8,16: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 141	177n. 52
III,8,16-9,17: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 142-144	178n. 57
III,11,20: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 146 f.	178n. 55
III,12,21: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 148	178n. 58
III,12,21: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 149	178n. 57
III,13,23: <i>CSEL</i> 60, 150	178n. 54

*De perfectione iustitiae hominis*

1,1: <i>BA</i> 21, 126	191n. 140
2,1: <i>BA</i> 21, 128	191n. 141,
	192n. 154

- 2,2: *BA* 21, 128 191n. 142 16,32: *BA* 24, 560 290n. 487  
 2,3: *BA* 21, 130 192n. 152, 17,34: *BA* 24, 568–570 290n. 488  
 193n. 159 18,36–37: *BA* 24, 578–580  
 2,3–4: *BA* 21, 130 191n. 143 290n. 489  
 2,4: *BA* 21, 130–132 193n. 157; 19,38: *BA* 24, 584 290n. 491  
 158 20,42: *BA* 24, 592 290n. 490  
 3,5–8: *BA* 21, 132–136 191n. 144, 193n. 160  
 3,7: *BA* 21, 134 193n. 161  
 4,10: *BA* 21, 140 194n. 164  
 4,9: *BA* 21, 136 191n. 142; 145  
 4,9: *BA* 21, 138 192n. 153  
 5,11: *BA* 21, 140 191n. 146  
 6,12: *BA* 21, 142 192n. 148  
 6,13: *BA* 21, 144 192n. 149; 156  
 6,14: *BA* 21, 146 192n. 147  
 6,15: *BA* 21, 146 192n. 150  
 6,15: *BA* 21, 148 192n. 155  
 7,16: *BA* 21, 148 192n. 151  
 7,16: *BA* 21, 148–150 193n. 163  
 8,19: *BA* 21, 156–158 194n. 165  
 11,28: *BA* 21, 176 194n. 166  
 12,29: *BA* 21, 178 194n. 167  
 20,43: *BA* 21, 214 193n. 162
- De praedestinatione sanctorum*  
 1,2–2,3: *BA* 24, 466–468 286n. 466  
 3,7: *BA* 24, 478 2n. 2, 85n. 59, 287n. 475  
 4,8: *BA* 24, 484–486 287n. 475  
 4,8: *BA* 24, 488 2n. 2, 85n. 61  
 5,10: *BA* 24, 496 288n. 476  
 8,15: *BA* 24, 512 288n. 478  
 9,18: *BA* 24, 520 288n. 477  
 10,19: *BA* 24, 522 288n. 479; 480  
 10,19: *BA* 24, 524 288n. 481  
 12,24: *BA* 24, 534–536 289n. 482  
 14,29: *BA* 24, 550 289n. 483  
 15,30: *BA* 24, 552–554 289n. 484; 485  
 15,31: *BA* 24, 556–558 290n. 486
- De quantitate animae*  
 1,2–2,3: *CSEL* 89, 133 16n. 5  
 28,55: *CSEL* 89, 201 17n. 9; 10  
 32,73: *CSEL* 89, 221 f. 17n. 11  
 34,77: *CSEL* 89, 225 16n. 5  
 34,78: *CSEL* 89, 227 18n. 14; 15  
 36,80: *CSEL* 89, 229 18n. 13
- De sancta virginitate*  
 1,1: *BA* 3, 110 125n. 152  
 2,2: *BA* 3, 112 110n. 34; 35  
 5,5: *BA* 3, 118 110n. 34  
 13,12: *BA* 3, 128 125n. 151  
 26,26: *BA* 3, 158 124n. 149  
 31,31: *BA* 3, 168 125n. 153  
 33,33: *BA* 3, 174–176 125n. 153  
 34,34: *BA* 3, 178 125n. 154  
 37,37: *BA* 3, 184 125n. 153  
 40,41: *BA* 3, 194 125n. 155  
 41,42: *BA* 3, 196 125n. 157  
 41,43: *BA* 3, 198 125n. 152  
 43,44: *BA* 3, 202 125n. 159  
 45,46: *BA* 3, 204–206 124n. 150  
 48,48: *BA* 3, 210–212 125n. 156  
 50,51: *BA* 3, 214 125n. 158
- De sermone Domini in monte*  
 I,4,12: *CCL* 35, 11 f. 49n. 63  
 I,22,73: *CCL* 35, 83 48n. 62  
 I,22,75: *CCL* 35, 84, 183<sup>1</sup> 48n. 61  
 I,22,75: *CCL* 35, 85, 1846 f. 48n. 61  
 I,23,78: *CCL* 35, 87 f. 48n. 58  
 II,4,16: *CCL* 35, 106 48n. 59  
 II,4,16: *CCL* 35, 107 48n. 60
- De spiritu et littera*  
 2,4: *CSEL* 60, 156 f. 182n. 79  
 3,5: *CSEL* 60, 157 182n. 81

*De spiritu et littera (cont.)*

- 4,6: *CSEL* 60, 158 183n. 89,  
187n. 107  
5,7: *CSEL* 60, 159 186n. 104  
6,9: *CSEL* 60, 161 183n. 88  
8,13: *CSEL* 60, 165 183n. 91  
8,13: *CSEL* 60, 166 183n. 90  
8,14: *CSEL* 60, 166 183n. 83  
9,15: *CSEL* 60, 168 184n. 95  
11,18: *CSEL* 60, 170 f. 184n. 93  
13,22: *CSEL* 60, 175 183n. 86  
14,23: *CSEL* 60, 176 f. 183n. 83  
17,29: *CSEL* 60, 182 f. 183n. 84  
19,32: *CSEL* 60, 185 f. 182n. 81,  
183n. 85  
21,36: *CSEL* 60, 189 f. 182n. 82  
24,41: *CSEL* 60, 194 182n. 82  
25,42: *CSEL* 60, 196 182n. 81,  
183n. 84  
26,43–44: *CSEL* 60, 196–198 182n. 82  
26,45: *CSEL* 60, 199 184n. 92  
28,48: *CSEL* 60, 202 f. 182n. 82  
29,51: *CSEL* 60, 208 183n. 87  
30,52: *CSEL* 60, 208 184n. 94  
31,53–54: *CSEL* 60, 209–212 185n. 98  
31,53: *CSEL* 60, 210 187n. 106  
33,57: *CSEL* 60, 215 f. 185n. 97  
33,58: *CSEL* 60, 216 f. 186n. 105  
33,59: *CSEL* 60, 219 185n. 99  
34,60: *CSEL* 60, 220 f. 185n. 100; 101;  
102, 186n. 103  
35,63: *CSEL* 60, 222 181n. 76

*De Trinitate*

- IV,1,2: *CCL* 50, 161 246n. 230  
IV,2,4: *CCL* 50, 163 f. 243n. 216  
IV,20,29: *CCL* 50, 199 f. 244n. 217  
V,11,12–12,13: *CCL* 50, 219 f. 244n. 217  
V,11,12: *CCL* 50, 219 f. 243n. 214  
V,14,15: *CCL* 50, 222 f. 109n. 26,  
243n. 212,  
244n. 217,  
246n. 232

- V,15,16–16,17: *CCL* 50, 224 f. 244n. 220  
V,16,17: *CCL* 50, 226 f. 244n. 225,  
247n. 234  
VI,5,7: *CCL* 50, 235 243n. 213;  
214  
VII,3,6: *CCL* 50, 254 243n. 215  
VII,6,12: *CCL* 50, 266 f. 241n. 199;  
200,  
243n. 211  
VIII,3,5: *CCL* 50, 274 242n. 209  
VIII,7,11: *CCL* 50, 285 244n. 224  
VIII,8,12: *CCL* 50, 286–288 244n. 223  
IX,3,3–5,8: *CCL* 50, 295–301 241n. 202  
IX,11,16: *CCL* 50, 307 242n. 210,  
243n. 211  
X,11,17: *CCL* 50, 330 114n. 72  
X,11,17–12,19: *CCL* 50, 329–332 241n. 203  
XI,5,8: *CCL* 50, 344 240n. 198  
XII,6,7: *CCL* 50, 361 f. 241n. 200  
XII,7,12: *CCL* 50, 367 240n. 198  
XII,11,16: *CCL* 50, 370 243n. 211  
XIII,9,12: *CCL* 50A, 399 246n. 231  
XIII,10,13–14: *CCL* 50A, 400 247n. 233  
XIII,16,20: *CCL* 50A, 409 f. 247n. 234  
XIV,4,6: *CCL* 50A, 428 241n. 206  
XIV,8,11: *CCL* 50A, 436 242n. 207  
XIV,12,15: *CCL* 50A, 442 f. 241n. 205  
XIV,14,18: *CCL* 50A, 446 241n. 204  
XIV,14,20: *CCL* 50A, 448 242n. 208  
XIV,15,21: *CCL* 50A, 449 246n. 229  
XIV,16,22: *CCL* 50A, 451 245n. 227  
XIV,16,22: *CCL* 50A, 453 f. 245n. 226  
XV,8,14: *CCL* 50A, 480 245n. 228  
XV,17,27–27,50: *CCL* 50A, 501–533 243n. 213  
XV,17,31–18,32: *CCL* 50A, 506–508 244n. 219

- XV,19,36: *CCL* 50A, 512 f.  
 244n. 217;  
 218; 221;  
 222
- De unico baptismo*  
 2,3: *BA* 31, 666 138n. 29  
 3,4: *BA* 31, 668 138n. 32  
 5,7: *BA* 31, 676 148n. 79  
 5,8: *BA* 31, 678 139n. 38  
 6,8: *BA* 31, 680 140n. 45  
 7,9: *BA* 31, 680–682 138n. 27  
 8,14: *BA* 31, 694 143n. 58  
 13,22: *BA* 31, 708–710 143n. 60; 61  
 14,24: *BA* 31, 716–718 140n. 44,  
 142n. 55  
 15,25: *BA* 31, 720 141n. 46  
 15,26: *BA* 31, 724 140n. 45
- De utilitate credendi*  
 3,9: *BA* 8, 226 55n. 94  
 15,33: *BA* 8, 288 55n. 94
- De vera religione*  
 6,10: *CCL* 32, 194 30n. 88,  
 32n. 106  
 7,12: *CCL* 32, 196 30n. 86,  
 32n. 106  
 7,13: *CCL* 32, 196 30n. 87  
 11,21–22: *CCL* 32, 200 30n. 93  
 12,23: *CCL* 32, 202 31n. 96; 98  
 12,24: *CCL* 32, 202 31n. 99  
 12,25: *CCL* 32, 202 f. 31n. 100  
 16,30: *CCL* 32, 205 f. 32n. 101; 102  
 16,32: *CCL* 32, 207 31n. 100,  
 32n. 103  
 17,33: *CCL* 32, 207 30n. 89  
 20,39: *CCL* 32, 211 31n. 95; 97  
 22,41: *CCL* 32, 212 31n. 94  
 28,51: *CCL* 32, 220 32n. 105  
 30,54–58: *CCL* 32, 222–226 30n. 91  
 37,68: *CCL* 32, 231 30n. 92  
 44,82: *CCL* 32, 241 f. 17n. 8  
 46,87: *CCL* 32, 244 30n. 90  
 55,113: *CCL* 32, 260 32n. 104
- Enarrationes in Psalmos*  
 3,3: *CSEL* 93/1A, 83 46n. 52  
 3,9: *CSEL* 93/1A, 89 46n. 49; 50  
 17,2: *CSEL* 93/1A, 269 46n. 50  
 17,51: *CSEL* 93/1A, 293 46n. 49  
 18(2),2: *CCL* 38, 106,23–25 112n. 54  
 23,2: *CSEL* 93/1A, 337 46n. 53  
 23,10: *CSEL* 93/1A, 341–343 46n. 52  
 26,8: *CSEL* 93/1A, 363 47n. 54  
 30(2),1,3: *CCL* 38, 192 113n. 60  
 30(2),1,4: *CCL* 38, 193 113n. 59  
 30(2),1,4: *CCL* 38, 194 113n. 61  
 30(2),1,6: *CCL* 38, 194 f. 112n. 54,  
 113n. 57  
 30(2),2,13: *CCL* 38, 211 253n. 279  
 30(2),3,3: *CCL* 38, 214 112n. 55  
 31,1: *CSEL* 93/1A, 399 46n. 53  
 31(2),1: *CCL* 38, 224 47n. 53  
 31(2),3–4: *CCL* 38, 226 f. 57n. 97  
 31(2),6: *CCL* 38, 229 57n. 97  
 31(2),7: *CCL* 38, 230 112n. 54  
 31(2),7–9: *CCL* 38, 231 57n. 97  
 31(2),9: *CCL* 38, 231 113n. 58  
 32,4: *CSEL* 93/1A, 403 46n. 51  
 32(2),1,4: *CCL* 38, 249 245n. 227  
 32(2),1,4: *CCL* 38, 249,18 112n. 56  
 32(2),2,16: *CCL* 38, 266 245n. 227  
 34(1),12: *CCL* 38, 308 113n. 68  
 35,5: *CCL* 38, 325 f. 55n. 93  
 39,1: *CCL* 38, 424 138n. 28  
 39,10: *CCL* 38, 433 144n. 66  
 43,15: *CCL* 38, 487 114n. 69; 71,  
 115n. 85  
 44,3: *CCL* 38, 495 f. 110n. 35  
 44,7: *CCL* 38, 499 115n. 89  
 49,2: *CCL* 38, 575 f. 110n. 41  
 49,21: *CCL* 38, 591 115n. 89  
 50,10: *CCL* 38, 606 124n. 146  
 52,5: *CSEL* 94/1, 95–97 122n. 134  
 52,8: *CSEL* 94/1, 101 114n. 69  
 53,10: *CSEL* 94/1, 126 112n. 53  
 55,7: *CSEL* 94/1, 195 115n. 88  
 55,20: *CSEL* 94/1, 218 f. 113n. 66

*Enarrationes in Psalmos (cont.)*

- 57,20: *CSEL* 94/1, 309 109n. 28  
 57,21: *CSEL* 94/1, 310 f. 81n. 38  
 118(1),1: *CCL* 40, 1666 254n. 284  
 118(3),1: *CCL* 40, 1671 254n. 285  
 118(3),1: *CCL* 40, 1671 f. 255n. 286  
 118(4),2: *CCL* 40, 1674 257n. 305  
 118(7),3: *CCL* 40, 1683 256n. 295  
 118(8),3: *CCL* 40, 1687 256n. 295  
 118(8),4: *CCL* 40, 1687 f. 256n. 295  
 118(9),1: *CCL* 40, 1689 255n. 288  
 118(10),5: *CCL* 40, 1694 257n. 302  
 118(11),1: *CCL* 40, 1696 256n. 301  
 118(11),4-5: *CCL* 40, 1698 257n. 305  
 118(11),6: *CCL* 40, 1698 255n. 293  
 118(14),4: *CCL* 40, 1710 257n. 306  
 118(16),1: *CCL* 40, 1716 255n. 292  
 118(16),6: *CCL* 40, 1718 255n. 291  
 118(17),1-2: *CCL* 40, 1718 f. 256n. 296;  
 297  
 118(17),3: *CCL* 40, 1720 256n. 298  
 118(17),5: *CCL* 40, 1721 255n. 287  
 118(17),8: *CCL* 40, 1722 257n. 303  
 118(19),3: *CCL* 40, 1727 255n. 290  
 118(19),6: *CCL* 40, 1728 255n. 291  
 118(22),2: *CCL* 40, 1737 257n. 302  
 118(23),8: *CCL* 40, 1744 255n. 294  
 118(25),5: *CCL* 40, 1750 255n. 289,  
 257n. 304  
 118(25),6: *CCL* 40, 1751 255n. 293  
 118(26),1: *CCL* 40, 1753 257n. 302  
 118(27),3: *CCL* 40, 1758 256n. 299;  
 300  
 118(27),6: *CCL* 40, 1759 257n. 305;  
 306

*Enchiridion ad Laurentium*

- 9,30: *CCL* 46, 65 f. 260n. 326,  
 261n. 327  
 9,32: *CCL* 46, 67 261n. 329  
 12,40: *CCL* 46, 72 262n. 336,  
 263n. 338  
 13,46-47: *CCL* 46, 74 f. 261n. 332  
 14,48: *CCL* 46, 75 261n. 331

- 14,50-52: *CCL* 46, 76 262n. 337  
 22,81: *CCL* 46, 94 261n. 328  
 24,96-25,98: *CCL* 46, 100 f. 264n. 341  
 25,98-99: *CCL* 46, 101-103 263n. 339  
 26,100: *CCL* 46, 103 263n. 340  
 26,102: *CCL* 46, 104 264n. 341  
 28,105-106: *CCL* 46, 106 f. 261n. 330,  
 262n. 333  
 28,108: *CCL* 46, 107 262n. 335

*Epistula ad catholicos*

- 2,2: *BA* 28, 504 133n. 3  
 2,3: *BA* 28, 510 139n. 35  
 4,7: *BA* 28, 518-520 139n. 40  
 7,17-18: *BA* 28, 548 133n. 3  
 9,23: *BA* 28, 560-562 153n. 110  
 12,32: *BA* 28, 594 133n. 3  
 14,35: *BA* 28, 602-604 142n. 55  
 14,35: *BA* 28, 604-606 143n. 58  
 14,36: *BA* 28, 606-608 153n. 108  
 15,38: *BA* 28, 614 146n. 72  
 21,58: *BA* 28, 668 137n. 22  
 23,67: *BA* 28, 686 139n. 39  
 24,68: *BA* 28, 688 139n. 41  
 25,73-74: *BA* 28, 700-702 153n. 106

*Epistulae*

- 1A\*,1: *BA* 46B, 56 267n. 354,  
 268n. 360  
 21,3: *CSEL* 34/1, 51 45n. 47  
 87,7-8: *CSEL* 34/2, 402 ff. 150n. 85  
 93,1,1: *CSEL* 34/2, 445 f. 151n. 92  
 93,1,3: *CSEL* 34/2, 448 150n. 90  
 93,2,5: *CSEL* 34/2, 449 f. 151n. 95  
 93,2,7: *CSEL* 34/2, 451 152n. 96  
 93,5,16: *CSEL* 34/2, 461 151n. 91  
 93,5,17: *CSEL* 34/2, 461 f. 150n. 87  
 93,5,18: *CSEL* 34/2, 462 f. 150n. 88  
 93,6,20: *CSEL* 34/2, 464 150n. 89

- 98,1: *CSEL* 34/2, 521 174n. 36,  
176n. 46  
143,6: *CSEL* 44, 255 214n. 2  
146: *CSEL* 44, 273f. 167n. 3  
147,2,7: *CSEL* 44, 281 225n. 78  
147,5,12–13: *CSEL* 44, 285f.  
224n. 70  
147,6,18: *CSEL* 44, 290 224n. 70  
147,6,18: *CSEL* 44, 291 224n. 71  
147,7,19: *CSEL* 44, 292 224n. 72  
147,8,20: *CSEL* 44, 293 224n. 73  
147,9,21: *CSEL* 44, 295 225n. 80  
147,9,22: *CSEL* 44, 296f. 225n. 75  
147,11,26: *CSEL* 44, 299f. 225n. 75  
147,13,31: *CSEL* 44, 305 225n. 76  
147,15,37: *CSEL* 44, 311f. 225n. 77; 79  
147,19,47: *CSEL* 44, 322f.  
225n. 74; 78  
157,2,7: *CSEL* 44, 453f. 258n. 313  
157,2,8: *CSEL* 44, 454 258n. 315  
157,2,10: *CSEL* 44, 455f. 259n. 316  
157,3,15: *CSEL* 44, 463 259n. 317  
157,3,16: *CSEL* 44, 465 259n. 318  
157,3,22: *CSEL* 44, 471f. 160n. 5; 7  
165,1,1: *CSEL* 44, 542f. 219n. 35  
166,1,2: *CSEL* 44, 547 218n. 25  
166,3,6: *CSEL* 44, 554 218n. 26  
166,3,7: *CSEL* 44, 555f. 218n. 27  
166,4,10: *CSEL* 44, 560 218n. 29  
166,5,11: *CSEL* 44, 561f. 218n. 30  
166,6,16: *CSEL* 44, 568f. 218n. 31  
166,7,18–20: *CSEL* 44, 571–575  
218n. 28  
166,8,22–24: *CSEL* 44, 577–580  
218n. 32  
166,8,26: *CSEL* 44, 581f. 219n. 34  
166,9,27: *CSEL* 44, 582f. 219n. 33  
167,1,2: *CSEL* 44, 587f. 219n. 37  
167,3,12–13: *CSEL* 44, 599ff.  
194n. 164  
167,4,15: *CSEL* 44, 603 258n. 314  
173,10: *CSEL* 44, 647 147n. 77  
177,7: *CSEL* 44, 675 162n. 13  
177,15: *CSEL* 44, 683f. 162n. 13  
185,2,6ff.: *CSEL* 57, 5ff. 146n. 72  
185,2,6: *CSEL* 57, 5 147n. 77  
185,2,11–3,12: *CSEL* 57, 10f.  
146n. 72  
185,6,23: *CSEL* 57, 21f. 147n. 77,  
150n. 88  
185,6,24: *CSEL* 57, 23 151n. 94  
185,7,26: *CSEL* 57, 25 150n. 89  
186,1: *CSEL* 57, 46 168n. 5  
187,4,11: *CSEL* 57, 90 225n. 81  
187,4,14–15: *CSEL* 57, 92f.  
225n. 81  
187,5,16: *CSEL* 57, 93f. 225n. 82  
187,5,17: *CSEL* 57, 94f. 226n. 83  
187,6,18: *CSEL* 57, 97 226n. 84  
187,6,19: *CSEL* 57, 97f. 226n. 85  
187,6,20: *CSEL* 57, 98f. 227n. 86  
187,6,21: *CSEL* 57, 99f. 227n. 87  
187,8,29: *CSEL* 57, 106 227n. 88  
187,9,30–31: *CSEL* 57, 107–109  
227n. 90  
187,12,36: *CSEL* 57, 114 227n. 91  
190,4,14: *CSEL* 57, 148f. 224n. 66  
190,4,15: *CSEL* 57, 149f. 220n. 38; 39  
190,6,20: *CSEL* 57, 155f. 219n. 35,  
224n. 65  
191,2: *CSEL* 57, 164f. 163n. 19  
194,2,4–5: *CSEL* 57, 178–180  
211n. 239  
194,8,34: *CSEL* 57, 203 210n. 238
- Epistolae ad Galatas expositio*  
4,3: *CSEL* 84, 59 61n. 114  
15,11–17: *CSEL* 84, 70f. 61n. 115  
16,6–7: *CSEL* 84, 72 61n. 114  
17,6–10: *CSEL* 84, 74 63n. 129  
19,1–5: *CSEL* 84, 76 61n. 116  
21: *CSEL* 84, 79f. 61n. 117; 118  
24,10–11: *CSEL* 84, 87 62n. 124  
24,14: *CSEL* 84, 88 61n. 120  
25,9–10: *CSEL* 84, 90 62n. 125  
27,3–4: *CSEL* 84, 92 62n. 126  
30,10: *CSEL* 84, 96 63n. 127  
31,2: *CSEL* 84, 97 63n. 128  
38,3–4: *CSEL* 84, 106f. 63n. 130  
43,3: *CSEL* 84, 116f. 61n. 121  
43,4: *CSEL* 84, 117 62n. 123  
43,7–8: *CSEL* 84, 117 61n. 121

*Epistolae ad Galatas expositio (cont.)*

- 44,1-3: CSEL 84, 118 62n. 122  
 63,5-7: CSEL 84, 139 f. 63n. 131

*Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio*

- 1,1-2: CSEL 84, 145 59n. 105  
 1,4: CSEL 84, 146 59n. 106  
 8,4: CSEL 84, 155 60n. 107  
 8,4,2: CSEL 84, 155 60n. 108  
 8,4-5: CSEL 84, 155 60n. 111  
 9,1-2: CSEL 84, 156 60n. 109  
 9,6: CSEL 84, 156 60n. 110  
 11,1-2: CSEL 84, 159 60n. 111  
 22,3: CSEL 84, 177 61n. 112  
 23,7: CSEL 84, 179 61n. 112

*Expositio quarundam propositionum  
ex Epistola ad Romanos*

- praef.*: CSEL 84, 3 51n. 72  
 12,2-11: CSEL 84, 6-8 55n. 93  
 12,7: CSEL 84, 7 51n. 74  
 12,12: CSEL 84, 8 f. 51n. 75  
 13,19-14,20: CSEL 84, 9 52n. 82  
 15,21,2: CSEL 84, 9 51n. 76  
 20,26: CSEL 84, 10 52n. 77  
 25,31: CSEL 84, 13 52n. 80  
 29,37: CSEL 84, 16 51n. 73  
 34,41: CSEL 84, 18 52n. 79  
 37,44,3: CSEL 84, 19 52n. 81  
 37,45-46,4: CSEL 84, 20 52n. 81  
 44,52: CSEL 84, 24 f. 52n. 78  
 44,52,4: CSEL 84, 24 51n. 73  
 47,55,4: CSEL 84, 30 54n. 90  
 48,56: CSEL 84, 30 f. 63n. 127  
 52,60,11-12: CSEL 84, 34 f. 53n. 84  
 54,62,1-12: CSEL 84, 36-38 52n. 83  
 54,62,3: CSEL 84, 36 53n. 87  
 54,62,6-8: CSEL 84, 37 54n. 91  
 54,62,13: CSEL 84, 38 53n. 85

*In Epistolam Ioannis*

- 1,2: SC 75, 116 110n. 35  
 1,4: SC 75, 120 111n. 46  
 2,2: SC 75, 154 110n. 35

- 2,14: SC 75, 180 110n. 41  
 3,1: SC 75, 186 115n. 90  
 3,7: SC 75, 196-198 139n. 36  
 3,9: SC 75, 202 141n. 49  
 3,13: SC 75, 210 149n. 84  
 4,1: SC 75, 218 149n. 84  
 4,7: SC 75, 234 116n. 91  
 4,9: SC 75, 238 241n. 199  
 4,11: SC 75, 240 129n. 177,  
 176n. 46  
 4,12: SC 75, 240 125n. 158  
 5,3: SC 75, 252 125n. 158  
 5,6: SC 75, 258 138n. 28  
 6,5: SC 75, 288 125n. 158  
 7,7: SC 75, 324 114n. 77  
 7,8: SC 75, 328 115n. 82  
 7,10: SC 75, 332 114n. 78  
 7,11: SC 75, 334 138n. 28,  
 142n. 50  
 8,6: SC 75, 350 241n. 198  
 8,9: SC 75, 358 115n. 81  
 8,10: SC 75, 360 115n. 80  
 9,5: SC 75, 390 114n. 74  
 9,5-7: SC 75, 388-392 114n. 76  
 9,9: SC 75, 396-398 114n. 79  
 9,10: SC 75, 402 114n. 75  
 9,11: SC 75, 404 115n. 82  
 10,1-3: SC 75, 412-414 115n. 82  
 10,2-3: SC 75, 412-416 139n. 34  
 10,4: SC 75, 418 114n. 73  
 10,5-6: SC 75, 422-424 114n. 73  
 10,7: SC 75, 428 115n. 80  
 10,10: SC 75, 436 139n. 35,  
 146n. 72

*In Iohannis evangelium*

- 1,4: CCL 36, 2 110n. 40  
 2,6: CCL 36, 14 111n. 46  
 2,13: CCL 36, 17 f. 109n. 33  
 2,15-16: CCL 36, 19 109n. 32  
 3,2: CCL 36, 20 f. 127n. 167  
 3,4: CCL 36, 22 241n. 198  
 3,8-9: CCL 36, 24 f. 127n. 162  
 3,10: CCL 36, 25 127n. 164  
 3,12: CCL 36, 25 f. 127n. 166,  
 128n. 169

- 3,14: *CCL* 36, 27 128n. 171  
 3,15: *CCL* 36, 27 128n. 170  
 3,16: *CCL* 36, 27 127n. 168  
 3,20: *CCL* 36, 29 127n. 163  
 3,21: *CCL* 36, 30,27–29 114n. 71  
 4,10: *CCL* 36, 36 124n. 147  
 5,5–6: *CCL* 36, 43 138n. 27  
 5,6: *CCL* 36, 43 136n. 13  
 5,11: *CCL* 36, 46 142n. 50  
 5,12: *CCL* 36, 47 245n. 227  
 6,2: *CCL* 36, 54 142n. 56  
 6,12: *CCL* 36, 59 141n. 50  
 6,15: *CCL* 36, 61 138n. 28  
 10,6: *CCL* 36, 104 113n. 62  
 10,7: *CCL* 36, 105 115n. 86  
 11,3: *CCL* 36, 111 129n. 173  
 11,10: *CCL* 36, 116 129n. 174  
 11,13–15: *CCL* 36, 118–120 146n. 72  
 14,1: *CCL* 36, 141 111n. 43  
 14,3: *CCL* 36, 143 115n. 87  
 14,6: *CCL* 36, 144 243n. 212  
 14,8: *CCL* 36, 146 f. 128n. 172,  
 129n. 175;  
 176  
 14,13: *CCL* 36, 150 109n. 31  
 15,3: *CCL* 36, 151 136n. 13  
 17,2: *CCL* 36, 171 248n. 237  
 17,6: *CCL* 36, 173 248n. 238  
 17,8: *CCL* 36, 174 f. 248n. 239  
 20,3: *CCL* 36, 204 250n. 252  
 21,7–8: *CCL* 36, 216 248n. 245  
 25,10: *CCL* 36, 252 251n. 264  
 26,2: *CCL* 36, 260 f. 250n. 250  
 26,3: *CCL* 36, 261 249n. 249  
 26,4: *CCL* 36, 261 249n. 248  
 26,4–5: *CCL* 36, 261 f. 249n. 247,  
 250n. 251  
 26,7: *CCL* 36, 263 250n. 253  
 26,15: *CCL* 36, 267 250n. 258  
 29,6: *CCL* 36, 287 250n. 257  
 32,1: *CCL* 36, 300 250n. 254  
 32,8: *CCL* 36, 304 249n. 246  
 36,8: *CCL* 36, 329 250n. 255  
 42,16: *CCL* 36, 373 250n. 258  
 43,1: *CCL* 36, 373 251n. 262  
 43,7: *CCL* 36, 375 251n. 263  
 45,12–14: *CCL* 36, 394–396 250n. 258  
 46,5: *CCL* 36, 400 251n. 264  
 48,6: *CCL* 36, 415 252n. 274  
 48,9: *CCL* 36, 417 253n. 276  
 51,11: *CCL* 36, 443 f. 251n. 264  
 53,4–6: *CCL* 36, 453–455 252n. 268  
 53,6: *CCL* 36, 454 f. 252n. 269  
 53,8: *CCL* 36, 455 f. 251n. 267,  
 253n. 277  
 53,11: *CCL* 36, 457 251n. 265  
 55,4: *CCL* 36, 465 252n. 270  
 65,3: *CCL* 36, 492 248n. 240  
 67,2: *CCL* 36, 496 249n. 246  
 68,1: *CCL* 36, 497 250n. 258  
 72,3: *CCL* 36, 508 250n. 259  
 74,2: *CCL* 36, 513 f. 248n. 238;  
 242  
 81,2: *CCL* 36, 530 250n. 260,  
 251n. 265  
 82,3: *CCL* 36, 533 248n. 243  
 83,1: *CCL* 36, 534 f. 250n. 258  
 83,3: *CCL* 36, 536 248n. 241;  
 244  
 85,3: *CCL* 36, 539 f. 251n. 263  
 86,2: *CCL* 36, 542 252n. 271;  
 273  
 87,3: *CCL* 36, 545 252n. 273  
 91,4: *CCL* 36, 555 251n. 264  
 95,2: *CCL* 36, 565 f. 251n. 261  
 96,4: *CCL* 36, 571 250n. 252  
 96,5: *CCL* 36, 572 250n. 256  
 97,1: *CCL* 36, 573 250n. 252  
 98,3: *CCL* 36, 578 251n. 266  
 102,5: *CCL* 36, 597 248n. 243  
 105,4–8: *CCL* 36, 605–608 253n. 280  
 107,1: *CCL* 36, 613 253n. 278  
 107,3: *CCL* 36, 614 253n. 281  
 108,2: *CCL* 36, 607 253n. 282  
 110,3: *CCL* 36, 623 f. 253n. 280  
 111,1: *CCL* 36, 628 253n. 275  
 115,4: *CCL* 36, 645 252n. 272  
 118,4: *CCL* 36, 657 253n. 279



*In Iohannis evangelium (cont.)*

122,8: CCL 36, 673	248n. 237
124,5: CCL 36, 684	253n. 283

*Quaestiones evangeliorum*

I,28: CCL 44B, 23	107n. 12
I,31: CCL 44B, 25	110n. 35
I,39: CCL 44B, 31	110n. 37
II,8: CCL 44B, 52	107n. 14
II,10: CCL 44B, 53	113n. 65
II,20: CCL 44B, 64	107n. 14
II,33,3: CCL 44B, 77	108n. 15
II,39,2: CCL 44B, 95	107n. 14

*Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*

II,9: CCL 33, 72	260n. 323
II,18: CCL 33, 76f.	260n. 324
II,107: CCL 33, 122	260n. 325

*Retractationes*

<i>prol.</i> 3: CCL 57, 6f.	1n. 1
I,9,1: CCL 57, 23	19n. 16
I,9,2: CCL 57, 23f.	265n. 346
I,9,3–4: CCL 57, 26	188n. 111
I,10,3: CCL 57, 32	264n. 343
I,11,4: CCL 57, 35	100n. 57
I,13,5: CCL 57, 38	264n. 342, 265n. 345
I,15,2: CCL 57, 45f.	264n. 344, 265n. 348
I,15,4: CCL 57, 47f.	265n. 346
I,16,2: CCL 57, 52	264n. 342
I,19,1: CCL 57, 55f.	266n. 348
I,22,4: CCL 57, 66	265n. 346
I,23–25: CCL 57, 66–74	61n. 113
I,23,1: CCL 57, 68	265n. 348
I,23,2: CCL 57, 68f.	266n. 349
I,23,3: CCL 57, 69f.	265n. 346
I,24,2: CCL 57, 72	265n. 348
I,26: CCL 57, 74	28n. 72
I,26: CCL 57, 77	265n. 346
I,26: CCL 57, 84	265n. 348
II,1,1: CCL 57, 89f.	2n. 2, 71n. 6, 79n. 30, 85n. 59, 265n. 348, 266n. 350

II,4,1: CCL 57, 92	106n. 10
II,5: CCL 57, 93f.	145n. 67
II,8: CCL 57, 97	265n. 346
II,13: CCL 57, 99f.	116n. 92
II,15,1: CCL 57, 101	240n. 195
II,24,2: CCL 57, 110	241n. 206
II,33: CCL 57, 116f.	167n. 2, 168n. 6
II,43,1: CCL 57, 124f.	266n. 351, 267n. 354
II,43,2: CCL 57, 125	268n. 360
II,45: CCL 57, 126f.	219n. 36
II,67: CCL 57, 142	281n. 442

*Sermones*

112,7,8: PL 38, 647f.	151n. 94
151,1: CCL 41Ba, 13f.	235n. 156
151,2: CCL 41Ba, 14	234n. 138
151,3: CCL 41Ba, 17f.	232n. 124
151,4: CCL 41Ba, 19	233n. 130; 131
151,4: CCL 41Ba, 20f.	239n. 191
151,5: CCL 41Ba, 21	232n. 125
151,5: CCL 41Ba, 23	233n. 129
151,6: CCL 41Ba, 23	235n. 157
151,6: CCL 41Ba, 24	235n. 155
151,6: CCL 41Ba, 25	233n. 133
151,7: CCL 41Ba, 25	234n. 145
151,7: CCL 41Ba, 26	234n. 142
151,7: CCL 41Ba, 27	237n. 171
151,8: CCL 41Ba, 30	239n. 191
152,2: CCL 41Ba, 35	234n. 141; 145
152,3: CCL 41Ba, 35f.	233n. 126
152,4: CCL 41Ba, 36	232n. 121; 124, 233n. 137
152,5: CCL 41Ba, 37f.	238n. 187
152,6: CCL 41Ba, 39f.	232n. 122, 236n. 170
152,7: CCL 41Ba, 41f.	232n. 118, 236n. 166
152,8: CCL 41Ba, 42	234n. 149
152,9: CCL 41Ba, 43	234n. 150
152,11: CCL 41Ba, 45f.	232n. 118, 235n. 151

- 153,2-5: *CCL* 41Ba, 50-56  
 232n. 122  
 153,5: *CCL* 41Ba, 56 236n. 167  
 153,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 58 f. 237n. 171  
 153,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 59 f. 233n. 126,  
 237n. 172  
 153,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 62 f. 238n. 179;  
 180  
 153,10: *CCL* 41Ba, 65 f. 238n. 185  
 153,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 68 232n. 122  
 153,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 71 f. 232n. 125,  
 234n. 149  
 154,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 76 232n. 118  
 154,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 77 236n. 169  
 154,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 78 f. 235n. 156  
 154,3-4: *CCL* 41Ba, 79-81  
 236n. 161  
 154,3: *CCL* 41Ba, 79 235n. 157  
 154,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 80 235n. 159  
 154,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 86 234n. 143  
 154,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 86 f. 234n. 140;  
 144  
 154,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 88 234n. 146  
 154,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 88 f. 232n. 121,  
 233n. 132  
 154,10: *CCL* 41Ba, 90 f. 235n. 157  
 154,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 91 f. 233n. 134,  
 235n. 158  
 154,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 93-95 234n. 145  
 154,13: *CCL* 41Ba, 95 232n. 121;  
 124  
 154,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 96 235n. 160  
 154,17: *CCL* 41Ba, 100 f. 234n. 148,  
 238n. 177  
 155,1: *CCL* 41Ba, 105 233n. 127;  
 128  
 155,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 107 236n. 166  
 155,3: *CCL* 41Ba, 110 236n. 168  
 155,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 111 237n. 171,  
 238n. 186  
 155,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 113 f. 232n. 118,  
 238n. 184  
 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 115 f. 235n. 152; 153,  
 236n. 166  
 155,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 116 f. 235n. 154  
 155,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 118 f. 235n. 151  
 155,8: *CCL* 41Ba, 120 238n. 188  
 155,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 121 238n. 186  
 155,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 123 232n. 121  
 155,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 125 233n. 136  
 155,13: *CCL* 41Ba, 126 f. 232n. 123,  
 238n. 178,  
 239n. 191  
 155,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 127 238n. 185  
 155,15: *CCL* 41Ba, 130 234n. 147  
 156,1-2: *CCL* 41Ba, 136 f. 236n. 169  
 156,2: *CCL* 41Ba, 138 238n. 182  
 156,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 140 f. 237n. 173  
 156,4: *CCL* 41Ba, 142 238n. 181  
 156,5: *CCL* 41Ba, 142 238n. 183  
 156,6: *CCL* 41Ba, 144 f. 233n. 135  
 156,7: *CCL* 41Ba, 146-148  
 237n. 175;  
 176  
 156,9: *CCL* 41Ba, 149 f. 234n. 139,  
 236n. 165,  
 239n. 192  
 156,10: *CCL* 41Ba, 150 f. 237n. 174  
 156,11: *CCL* 41Ba, 152 239n. 189  
 156,12-13: *CCL* 41Ba, 153 f.  
 236n. 163  
 156,12: *CCL* 41Ba, 153 239n. 190  
 156,13: *CCL* 41Ba, 154 236n. 162;  
 164  
 156,14: *CCL* 41Ba, 156 f. 232n. 118
- Soliloquia*  
 I,1,2: *CSEL* 89, 4 13n. 36  
 I,1,3: *CSEL* 89, 5 12n. 33  
 I,1,3: *CSEL* 89, 6 13n. 37,  
 14n. 42  
 I,1,3: *CSEL* 89, 7 13n. 40  
 I,1,4: *CSEL* 89, 8 13n. 41  
 I,1,5: *CSEL* 89, 9 f. 12n. 34,  
 13n. 35; 39  
 I,15,28: *CSEL* 89, 42 12n. 32  
 II,1,1: *CSEL* 89, 45 13n. 38  
 II,1,1: *CSEL* 89, 47 12n. 31

## I.3. AUCTORES ANTIQUI

## AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS

*De excessu fratris Satyri*

II,6: CSEL 73, 254 206n. 225

*De Noe*

3,7b: CSEL 32/1, 417 332n. 182

*De paradiso*

13,67: CSEL 32/1, 325 330n. 171

*Expositio Evangelii sec. Lucam*

2,56: CSEL 32/4, 72 332n. 182

7,234: CSEL 32/4, 387 330n. 171

*Fragmenta in Esaiam*

1: CCL 14, 405 305n. 43

## ARISTOTELES

*Categoriae*

10, 12a17–25 321n. 122

*De motu animalium*

6, 700b23 348n. 5

*Ethica Eudemia*

II,6, 1223a4–9 348n. 8

II,6, 1223a9 ff. 348n. 9

II,7, 1223b7 f. 348n. 4

II,8, 1224b8 ff. 349n. 16

II,9, 1225b11 ff. 349n. 16

II,10, 1226a7 ff. 348n. 7

II,10, 1226b2 ff. 348n. 5

II,10, 1226b16 f. 348n. 6

II,10, 1226b30 ff. 348n. 10

II,10, 1227a3 f. 348n. 5

II,10, 1227a28 ff. 348n. 4

*Ethica Nicomachea*

I,3, 1095b19 ff. 348n. 9

III,3, 111a24 ff. 348n. 10

III,4, 111b6–10 348n. 10

III,4, 111b13 f. 349n. 16

III,5, 1112b11 ff. 348n. 7

III,5, 1113a10 f. 348n. 6

III,6, 1113a14 ff. 348n. 4

III,7, 1113b3 ff. 348n. 7; 9

VI,2, 1138b31–34 348n. 7

VII,8, 1150b19 ff. 349n. 16

*Rhetorica*

I,10, 1368b11 ff. 349n. 16

I,10, 1369a2–4 348n. 4

## CICERO

*Academica priora*

II,6,18: Reid 195 29n. 79

*Academica posteriora*

I,11,40: Reid 151 29n. 79

*De divinatione*

II 272n. 385

*De fato*

10,20: Plasberg-Ax 139 272n. 385

11,25: Plasberg-Ax 141 273n. 388

16,36: Plasberg-Ax 146 f. 283n. 455

17,40: Plasberg-Ax 148 272n. 385

*De inventione*

II,53,159–54,167: Achard 224–227

29n. 83

II,53,161: Achard 225 29n. 83

*De natura deorum*

III 272n. 385

*Hortensius*

frag. 69I/70I 9n. 8

frag. 69II/70II 9n. 8

frag. 69III/70III 9n. 8

*Topica*

15,58–59: Riccio Coletti 77 f.

283n. 455

## CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS

*Strom.*

III,100,5: GCS, Clemens II, 242

306n. 48

## COLLECTIO VATICANA

82,13: ACO I,1,3, 9 163n. 21

## CONCILIA AFRICAE

CCL 149, 69–73 162n. 16

## CONCILIORUM OECUMENICORUM

*DECRETA**Synodi Ephes. I ep. generalis de**orientalibus episcopis* 163n. 21

## CYPRIANUS CARTHAGINENSIS

*Ad Donatum*

3-4: CCL 3A, 4f. 94n. 29

*Ad Quirinum*

3,4: CCL 3, 92 266n. 350

*Epistularium*

64: CCL 3C, 418-425 176n. 46

64,5,2: CCL 3C, 424f. 305n. 43

73: CCL 3C, 529-562 134n. 7

## DIOGENES LAERTIUS

*Vitae*

VII,127 321n. 122

## HIERONYMUS

*Adversus Iovinianum*

II: PL 23, 284a-b 176n. 46

*Apologia adversus libros Rufini*

III,28: PL 23, 478c-d 219n. 35

*Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*

22: PL 23, 372b-373a 219n. 35

*Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*

161n. 11

*Epistulae*

81,2: CSEL 55, 107 161n. 10

133: CSEL 56, 241-260 161n. 11

*In Ionam*

3,5: CCL 76, 406 176n. 46

## IOHANNES CASSIANUS

*Collationes*

3,12: SC 42, 155-157 287n. 467

13,7: SC 54, 154-156 287n. 474

13,11: SC 54, 162 287n. 469

13,12: SC 54, 164-166 287n. 473

13,13: SC 54, 168 287n. 470

13,15-16: SC 54, 174-176 287n. 472

13,17-18: SC 54, 178-180 287n. 471

## IULIANUS AECLANENSIS

*Ad Florum* see Augustinus, *Contra**Iulianum opus imperfectum**Ad Turbantium*

I, frag. 1: CCL 88, 340f. 303n. 25

I, frag. 14-15: CCL 88, 342-344 303n. 26

I, frag. 18: CCL 88, 345 303n. 32

I, frag. 20: CCL 88, 345 303n. 27

I, frag. 21-29: CCL 88, 345-348 304n. 28

I, frag. 22: CCL 88, 345f. 303n. 26

I, frag. 31-32: CCL 88, 348f. 304n. 33

I, frag. 33-41: CCL 88, 349f. 304n. 29

I, frag. 44-45: CCL 88, 351 304n. 30

I, frag. 48: CCL 88, 351 304n. 30

I, frag. 62: CCL 88, 355f. 304n. 29

I, frag. 64: CCL 88, 356f. 304n. 33

I, frag. 68: CCL 88, 357 304n. 33

I, frag. 74: CCL 88, 358f. 303n. 27

I, frag. 75: CCL 88, 359f. 304n. 33

I, frag. 78: CCL 88, 360 304n. 35

II, frag. 94: CCL 88, 363 304n. 30

II, frag. 108: CCL 88, 365 303n. 26

II, frag. 113: CCL 88, 366 303n. 26

II, frag. 124: CCL 88, 367 303n. 26

II, frag. 130: CCL 88, 368 304n. 30

II, frag. 135: CCL 88, 368 303n. 27

II, frag. 138: CCL 88, 369f. 322n. 125

II, frag. 146: CCL 88, 371 304n. 30

II, frag. 149-153: CCL 88, 371f. 322n. 125

III, frag. 159-164: CCL 88, 373f. 322n. 125

III, frag. 220: CCL 88, 382 318n. 105

IV, frag. 284: CCL 88, 388 318n. 107

IV, frag. 316: CCL 88, 394 310n. 65

IV, frag. 324a: CCL 88, 395 304n. 34

*Ep. ad Romanos*

CCL 88, 396-398 307n. 51

*Ep. ad Rufum Thessalonicensem*

frag. 4: CCL 88, 337 310n. 70

*MARIUS MERCATOR**Commonitorium*

3,1: ACO I,5, 5 159n. 3

*ORIGENES**De principiis*

II,9,2: SC 252, 354-356 349n. 14

*In Epistulam ad Romanos*

V,1: FC 2/3, 44–46.52	174n. 34
V,9: FC 2/3, 162–164	174n. 34
VI,12: FC 2/3, 296	174n. 34

## PAULINUS NOLENSIS

*Carmina*

25: CSEL 30, 238–245	297n. 1
----------------------	---------

## PELAGIUS

*Ep. ad Demetriadem*

PL 30, 15–45 (= PL 33, 1099–1121)	170n. 18
-----------------------------------	----------

*Expositiones XIII Ep. Pauli*

Rom. 3,20–31: Souter 32–35	181n. 77, 183n. 83
Rom. 5,12: Souter 45	174n. 38
Rom. 7,14–23: Souter 58–60	265n. 347
Phil. 2,13: Souter 400	182n. 80

## PLOTINUS

*Enneades*

I,1(53),2,5–11	214n. 3
I,1(53),5,3	214n. 3
III,6(26),1–5	214n. 3
III,8(30),8–9	98n. 49

## PLUTARCHUS

*De communibus notitiis*

9: 1062b4–8	321n. 122
10: 1063a5–b1	321n. 122

## PORPHYRIUS

*Sententiae*

18: Lamberz 8f.	214n. 3
25: Lamberz 15	12n. 25

## RUFINUS PRESBYTER

*Liber de fide*

17: Miller 70–72	159n. 2
20: Miller 78	159n. 2
28: Miller 90–94	159n. 2, 204n. 214
36: Miller 108	159n. 2
38–39: Miller 110–114	204n. 214
51: Miller 128–130	159n. 2

## SENECA

*Epistulae morales*

107,11	272n. 384
--------	-----------

*Phaedra*

604f.	350n. 19
-------	----------

## TYCONIUS

*Regulae*

3	142n. 52
3,13,1: SC 488, 186	85n. 61

## VERGILIUS

*Eclogae*

II,65	249
-------	-----

## II

### INDEX NOMINUM

#### II.1. PERSONAE

- Adam 24, 26n. 62, 37n. 7, 40, 51,  
53, 63, 80f., 83, 87n. 67, 92, 98,  
108, 117, 122, 124, 127f., 152f., 159,  
160n. 5, 162n. 16, 165f., 172–178, 189,  
194f., 204f., 207, 209, 215–219, 223,  
232, 260–262, 263n. 338, 271, 277,  
282–284, 285n. 459, 294f., 311, 320,  
329–332, 339  
Adeodatus 8  
Albina 200  
Ambrose of Milan 8, 60n. 110, 69n. 2,  
71, 93n. 23, 206n. 225, 305f., 312,  
330n. 171, 332n. 182  
Ambrosiaster 50, 306, 312  
Anthony the Hermit 93  
Apollinaris 219n. 35  
Apuleius of Madaura 267, 267n. 355,  
274n. 398  
Aristotle 321n. 122, 347–350  
Arnauld, Antoine 285n. 459  
  
Basil of Caesarea 312  
Boniface I 163, 307, 312f.  
Boniface (*Ep.* 98) 176n. 46  
Boniface (*Ep.* 185) 146n. 72  
  
Caecilian of Carthage 134  
Caelestius 160, 162f., 163f.n. 21,  
167, 172f., 191–200, 204–206, 209,  
232n. 120, 297  
Celestine I 163  
Cicero 2, 7, 9n. 8, 10n. 12, 29, 93n. 23,  
272f., 283n. 455, 317n. 102, 327n. 152,  
342  
Cleanthes 272n. 384  
Clement of Alexandria 306  
  
Cresconius 137n. 26, 145, 154  
Cyprian of Carthage 85, 94n. 29, 134,  
142n. 52, 143, 176, 266, 287, 305f.,  
312  
Cyril of Alexandria 87, 164n. 21, 171,  
298n. 2  
  
Demetrius 170, 257  
Diogenes Laertius 321n. 122  
Donatus of Carthage 134  
  
Epictetus 349n. 13  
Eulogius of Caesarea 195  
Esau 53, 69, 75, 78, 80f., 102, 129, 210,  
266  
  
Faustus of Milevis 105  
Felix of Aptunga 134  
Felix (the Manichaean) 105  
Florus 163  
Fortunatus 35, 37, 63n. 132  
  
Gottschalk 1  
Gregory of Nazianzus 312  
  
Heros of Arles 195n. 168  
Hilary (from Gaul) 278, 286, 290  
Hilary of Poitiers 306, 312  
Hilary of Syracuse 160n. 7, 258  
Honorius (the Emperor) 132, 172  
Innocent I 162  
Irenaeus of Lyon 312  
  
Jacob 53, 69, 75f., 78, 80f., 102, 129,  
210, 263, 266  
James (the Apostle) 56

- Jerome 50, 161, 169n. 11, 170, 176,  
194n. 164, 217–219, 224, 239n. 193,  
312
- Job 113, 116, 230
- John the Baptist 111n. 43, 138n. 27,  
141n. 50
- John Cassian 164n. 21, 286 f.
- John Chrysostom 306, 312
- John of Jerusalem 171
- Julian of Eclanum 2, 4, 159n. 3, 163,  
174n. 38, 211, 213, 215, 270n. 373,  
297–340
- Juliana 257
- Lazarus of Aix 195n. 168, 286n. 466
- Luther, Martin 1, 181
- Mani 15, 192, 219n. 35, 324, 325n. 137
- Marcellinus 160, 162, 172, 181, 214, 218,  
219n. 35
- Marcion 192
- Marius Mercator 159n. 3, 164n. 21
- Marius Victorinus 8n. 4, 50, 71, 93
- Melania the Younger 200
- Monica 8, 99n. 51
- Nestorius 87, 163, 164n. 21
- Optatus of Milevis 134n. 5, 220
- Origen 50, 51n. 72, 159, 161, 170,  
173 f.n. 34, 199, 219n. 35, 221n. 53,  
265n. 347, 277, 338, 349n. 14
- Orosius 160, 217
- Parmenian 134, 145, 148
- Patticius 325n. 137
- Paul (the Apostle) 1, 2, 15, 35–65,  
69, 72, 83, 85 f., 93–95, 107n. 11, 116,  
135n. 12, 148, 150 f., 160, 174 f., 181, 185,  
195, 197, 199, 214, 232 f., 235, 237–  
239, 256, 265, 279, 287, 301, 304, 307,  
316, 335, 340
- Paulinus of Milan 160, 172n. 26,  
206n. 225
- Paulinus of Nola 90n. 6, 167n. 4, 168,  
169n. 11, 297
- Pelagius 56n. 95, 69, 97n. 43, 159–  
174, 181–183, 187–189, 191 f., 195–  
201, 203, 205, 209, 232n. 120, 236,  
239n. 193, 257, 265n. 347, 286n. 466,  
297, 312n. 76
- Peter (the Apostle) 143, 235, 253,  
260
- Petilian 146, 148 f.
- Phaedra 350n. 19
- Pinianus 200
- Plato 268n. 356, 348n. 3
- Plotinus 2, 7 f.n. 3, 98n. 49, 214 f.,  
326n. 143
- Plutarch 321n. 122
- Ponticianus 94
- Porphyry 7n. 3, 12n. 25, 98n. 49,  
214n. 3, 267, 268n. 356
- Priscillianists 219n. 35, 221n. 53
- Prosper of Aquitaine 164n. 21, 278,  
286, 290
- Pythagoras 219n. 35
- Renatus 220
- Rufinus of Aquileia 50, 159n. 2,  
161n. 10, 170, 173n. 34, 219n. 35
- Rufinus the Syrian 159, 161, 172n. 26,  
173, 204
- Seneca 22n. 34, 267, 272n. 384,  
349n. 14, 350n. 19
- Serapion of Thmuis 324n. 136
- Simon the Sorcerer 113, 138n. 33
- Simplicianus 8n. 4, 69–71, 75,  
90n. 6
- Sixtus III 163, 210, 278
- Tertullian 215n. 6, 219n. 35, 221n. 43,  
306n. 49, 325n. 142
- Theodore of Mopsuestia 159n. 3,  
263n. 338, 297n. 2, 326n. 144
- Theodorus, Flavius Mallius 8n. 4
- Theodosius I 135
- Theodosius II 164n. 21
- Thomas Aquinas 297n. 2
- Tyconius 50, 85, 142n. 52, 269n. 361

- Valentinus of Hadrumetum 278, 281,  
290  
Valerius (*comes*) 162n. 17, 298, 303,  
312  
Valerius of Hippo 45, 69  
Varro 267  
Vergil 249  
Vincentius Victor 150, 220–223  
Zosimus 162f.

## II.2. AUCTORES MODERNI

- Aalders, G.J.D. 325n. 137  
Agaësse, P. 106n. 9  
Alfaric, P. 7n. 2, 8n. 5, 15n. 1; 2,  
95n. 29  
Alflatt, M.E. 37n. 7; 11, 81n. 35  
Allison Brown, R. 10n. 13  
Altaner, B. 50n. 66; 67, 159n. 2,  
161n. 10  
Arand, L.A. 260n. 326, 262n. 333  
Arendt, H. 347n. 1  
Arnold, J. 244n. 221  
Babcock, W.S. 85n. 62  
Baguette, Ch. 8n. 6  
Bammel see Hammond Bammel, C.P.  
Barclift, Ph. L. 327n. 150  
Bastiaensen, A.A. 50n. 68; 69  
Bavaud, G. 134n. 7  
Beatrice, P.F. 7n. 3, 215n. 6, 306n. 49,  
307n. 50  
BeDuhn, J. 325n. 137  
Beierwaltes, W. 9n. 8  
Bernard, R. 284n. 459  
Berrouard, M.-F. 56n. 95, 106n. 8,  
127n. 165  
Berthold, F. 23n. 37  
Bochet, I. 30n. 84, 31n. 99, 37n. 11,  
46n. 48, 51n. 72, 56n. 95, 74n. 17,  
89n. 2, 90n. 5, 91n. 9, 93n. 25,  
94n. 27, 95n. 29, 96n. 36, 100n. 54,  
102n. 66, 105n. 1, 181n. 77, 228n. 93,  
241n. 201, 268n. 356; 360  
Bohlin, T. 171n. 22  
Böhling, A. 15n. 1  
Bok, N.W. den 19n. 18, 280n. 440  
Bonner, G. 8n. 5, 20n. 20, 47n. 56,  
58n. 100, 63n. 131, 159n. 2; 3, 160n. 6,  
161n. 10, 162n. 14, 169n. 11, 171n. 22,  
176n. 46, 181n. 78, 206n. 225,  
228n. 92  
Boublík, V. 83, 284n. 459  
Boulding, M. 94n. 26, 96n. 35,  
100n. 58, 102n. 69  
Bouton-Touboulic, A.-I. 10n. 17,  
21n. 27, 24n. 50, 26n. 63, 81n. 38,  
100n. 57, 102n. 70, 114n. 72, 118n. 114,  
120n. 129, 270n. 371, 272n. 383,  
278n. 424, 331n. 178  
Bouwman, G. 297n. 2  
Boyer, C. 285n. 464  
Brachtendorf, J. 94n. 28, 98n. 45,  
182n. 81, 240n. 196, 243n. 211  
Brandenhewer, O. 56n. 95  
Brown, P. 3n. 4, 8n. 5, 69n. 1, 97n. 43,  
105n. 1, 145n. 67, 151n. 93, 152n. 97,  
160n. 4, 161n. 9, 167n. 4, 171n. 23,  
200n. 191, 204n. 214, 267n. 352,  
322n. 124  
Browne, H. 116n. 91  
Bruckner, A. 297n. 2  
Bruning, B. 272n. 383  
Bruyne, D. de 50n. 71  
Buonaiuti, E. 58n. 100  
Burns, J.P. 3n. 7, 9n. 9, 25n. 53,  
32n. 104, 33n. 108, 35f.n. 2, 57n. 99,  
59n. 106, 64n. 135, 84, 91n. 9; 11,  
93n. 23, 96n. 36, 107n. 11, 135n. 12,  
139n. 34, 152n. 98, 153n. 109,  
265n. 347, 271n. 378  
Canning, R. 24n. 50, 114n. 72  
Capánaga, V. 46n. 48  
Cary, P. 85n. 57  
Casiday, A.M.C. 286n. 466



- Cayré, F. 101n. 64  
 Chadwick, H. 92n. 18, 97n. 38; 40; 42, 102n. 66  
 Chadwick, O. 287n. 468  
 Chappell, T.D.J. 349n. 16  
 Chéné, J. 286n. 466  
 Christopher, J.P. 113n. 67  
 Cipriani, N. 50n. 68, 170n. 18, 194n. 165, 312n. 76, 319n. 110, 324n. 136, 326n. 144  
 Clark, E.A. 27n. 66, 299 f.n. 12, 321n. 120  
 Colleran, J.M. 17n. 10, 18n. 14; 15  
 Congar, Y. 133n. 2  
 Courcelle, P. 7n. 3, 8n. 4, 17n. 6, 89n. 5, 94 f.n. 29, 167n. 4  
 Coyle, J.K. 15n. 1  
  
 De Capitani, F. 19n. 17, 39n. 18  
 Deane, H.A. 134n. 8, 145n. 67, 162n. 17  
 Decret, F. 15n. 1; 3, 37n. 7; 10, 105n. 2; 3; 4, 111n. 50  
 Deferrari, R.J. 268n. 357  
 Delaroche, B. 37n. 11, 49n. 65, 50n. 71, 168n. 9, 172n. 24, 174n. 38, 176n. 46  
 Desch, W. 30n. 84  
 Dewart, J. McW. 227n. 89, 263n. 338, 326n. 144  
 Di Palma, G. 175n. 38  
 Dideberg, D. 114n. 73  
 Dihle, A. 347n. 1  
 Dodaro, R. 56n. 95, 172n. 26  
 Doignon, J. 7n. 2, 9n. 9, 37n. 11  
 Dolbeau, F. 105n. 1  
 Dörries, H. 30n. 84  
 Drecoll, V.H. 9n. 11, 10n. 14, 19n. 16, 30n. 85, 31n. 96, 32n. 100; 106, 33n. 107; 108, 36n. 6, 45n. 47, 48n. 61, 50n. 68; 69, 54n. 89, 55n. 94, 57n. 99, 60n. 107, 61n. 119, 63 f.n. 133, 69n. 1, 73n. 11, 74n. 13, 76n. 22, 78n. 24, 80n. 32, 84, 86n. 64, 90n. 5; 6; 7, 91n. 9, 93n. 23; 24, 95n. 29, 96n. 36, 98n. 49, 99n. 51, 100n. 54, 107n. 11, 182n. 81, 246n. 229  
 Dunphy, W. 159n. 2, 161n. 10  
 Duval, Y.-M. 160n. 6, 161n. 8; 10; 12, 167n. 3, 168n. 4, 169n. 12, 170n. 19, 171n. 21, 257n. 307  
 Eßer, H.H. 171n. 22  
 Evans, G.R. 303n. 25, 331n. 181  
 Evans, R.F. 161n. 9  
 Feldmann, E. 36n. 6  
 Ferguson, J. 162n. 17  
 Ferrari, L.C. 92n. 17  
 Fidelibus, G. 274n. 397  
 Fiedrowicz, M. 46n. 48; 49, 106n. 7  
 Fitzgerald, A. 60n. 110  
 Flasch, K., 3n. 4; 6, 57n. 99, 80 f.n. 35, 81n. 37; 38, 82n. 40, 84, 86n. 66, 96n. 36, 103n. 71, 135n. 11; 12  
 Folliet, G. 57n. 99, 281n. 445  
 Fontanier, J.-M. 7n. 1  
 Frede, H.J. 170n. 15  
 Frede, M. 347n. 1, 348n. 11, 349n. 16  
 Fredouille, J.-C. 266n. 351  
 Fredriksen (Landes), P. 51n. 75; 76, 52n. 77; 83, 53n. 84, 54n. 90, 60n. 110, 86n. 65, 317n. 100  
 Friend, W.H.C. 133n. 2, 142n. 52  
 Freud, S. 2  
 Fuhrer, Th. 170n. 18, 317n. 102, 350n. 19  
 Gallagher, D.A. 24n. 45, 25n. 51; 52  
 Gallagher, I.J. 24n. 45, 25n. 51; 52  
 Gally, J. 115n. 82  
 García-Sánchez, C. 171n. 22  
 Garrigou-Lagrange, R. 285n. 464  
 Gilligan, T.F. 13n. 35; 40; 41  
 Gilson, E. 83n. 48  
 Girard, J.-M. 146n. 72, 173n. 28, 321n. 123  
 Grasmück, E.L. 145n. 67  
 Greshake, G. 171n. 22  
 Grossi, V. 127n. 166, 176n. 46, 177n. 48, 278n. 426, 281n. 442  
 Guy, J.-C. 268n. 357  
 Haider, F. 23n. 37  
 Hammond Bammel, C.P. 50n. 66, 51n. 72, 74n. 16, 173 f.n. 34

- Hanby, M. 87n. 67, 171n. 22,  
286n. 466
- Harl, M. 349n. 14
- Harnack, A. von 3n. 4, 10n. 14,  
60n. 107, 164n. 21, 297n. 2
- Harrison, C. 2n. 3, 19n. 16, 85,  
262n. 334
- Harrison, G. 325n. 137
- Hendriks, E. 240n. 195
- Hill, E. 27n. 70, 118n. 118, 119n. 126,  
120n. 127, 121n. 131; 132, 122n. 136,  
123n. 144, 234n. 142, 235n. 153,  
236n. 162; 170, 237n. 173, 238n. 180,  
239n. 189; 190; 192, 240n. 194,  
242n. 209; 210, 243n. 211, 245n. 227,  
246n. 231, 247n. 233, 338n. 7
- Hoffmann, A. 37n. 10
- Holte, R. 39n. 18; 23
- Holtzen, T.L. 281n. 440
- Hombert, P.-M. 3n. 7, 10n. 12; 14,  
12n. 34, 13n. 39, 18n. 15, 24n. 44,  
25n. 53, 26n. 62, 27n. 70, 31n. 96,  
46n. 48; 52, 50n. 70, 56n. 95,  
57n. 99, 64n. 134, 69n. 1, 78n. 25, 85,  
89n. 1; 5, 90n. 6; 8, 96n. 36, 97n. 43,  
105n. 1, 106n. 6; 7, 107n. 11, 125n. 158,  
126n. 160; 161, 128n. 170, 131n. 178,  
148n. 78, 168n. 6; 8, 228n. 92,  
240n. 195
- Honnay, G. 160n. 5
- Horn, Ch. 347n. 2, 348n. 3, 349n. 16
- Huftier, M. 18n. 14, 20n. 18,  
260n. 326
- Inez Bogan, M. 1n. 1, 71n. 6
- Inglebert, H. 367n. 351
- Janssen, K. 12n. 34, 14n. 43, 19n. 16,  
20 f.n. 27, 24n. 50, 32n. 106, 37n. 11,  
54n. 89, 60n. 107, 63n. 132; 133,  
64n. 136, 83, 107n. 11
- Jepson, J.J. 48n. 58; 59
- Jonas, H. 56n. 95
- Jourjon, M. 152n. 99
- Kahn, Ch. 348n. 3; 12
- Karfíková, L. 247n. 235, 267n. 355
- Karpp, H. 215n. 6
- Kearney, R. 129n. 159, 258n. 308; 310
- Keeler, M.J. 268n. 357
- Kenny, A. 348n. 3; 4, 349n. 16
- King, J.R. 137n. 17; 18, 140n. 43,  
142n. 53, 144n. 63, 149n. 82
- Kirwan, C. 197n. 180
- Kierkegaard, S. V
- Klíma, O. 324n. 137
- Kobusch, T. 349n. 14
- Kriegbaum, B. 133n. 2
- La Bonnardière, A.-M. 24n. 44,  
46n. 48, 106n. 8; 9, 125n. 158,  
135n. 9, 142n. 50, 146n. 72, 150n. 86,  
240n. 195, 246n. 230, 298n. 5
- Lamberigts, M. 160n. 5, 164n. 21,  
215n. 7, 298n. 2, 303n. 25, 317n. 102,  
320n. 112; 114, 322n. 126, 325n. 137,  
326n. 144
- Lamirande, E. 89n. 5
- Lancel, S. 8n. 5
- Laurence, P. 170n. 18
- Léon-Dufour, X. 185 f.n. 102
- Lettieri, G. 3n. 4, 85, 96n. 36,  
106n. 10, 181n. 77, 272n. 383
- Liebeschuetz, W. 162n. 17, 168n. 10,  
195n. 170
- Löhr, W.A. 169n. 12, 170n. 18
- López García, M.M. 181n. 78
- Lössl, J. 2n. 3, 4n. 8, 9n. 11, 30n. 85,  
31n. 99, 50n. 70; 71, 56n. 95, 57n. 99,  
58n. 101, 64n. 136, 71n. 2, 72n. 8,  
82n. 40, 84, 90n. 6, 91n. 9, 94n. 28,  
96n. 36, 97n. 43, 107n. 11, 129n. 176,  
134n. 7, 159n. 3, 162n. 17, 232n. 120,  
236n. 162, 239n. 193, 298n. 2,  
312n. 76, 329n. 164
- Lowrie, W. V
- Lyonnet, S. 175n. 38
- Madec, G. 8n. 4; 5, 19n. 16; 17,  
46n. 48, 266n. 351, 267n. 353,  
268n. 356
- Magris, A. 57n. 100, 311n. 74
- Maier, J.-L. 133n. 2
- Mara, M.G. 51n. 72

- Marafioti, D. 167n. 4, 181n. 77; 78,  
 183n. 83; 84, 185n. 96  
 Markus, R.A. 17n. 6, 134n. 7, 142n. 53,  
 147n. 77, 269n. 361  
 Marrocco, M. 242n. 208  
 Marrou, H.-I. 159n. 2; 3, 161n. 10,  
 164n. 21, 286n. 466, 297n. 2  
 Martin, T.F. 49n. 65, 56n. 95  
 Martinetto, G. 168n. 9, 169n. 11,  
 170n. 16  
 Mayer, C.P. 7n. 2, 8n. 5, 96n. 36,  
 133n. 1, 163n. 18, 322n. 126  
 McDonough, B.T. 19n. 17  
 McCool, G.A. 16n. 6  
 McGrath, A.E. 327n. 152  
 Moreau, M. 172n. 25  
 Moreschini, C. 161n. 9  
 Morris, J. 162n. 17, 168n. 7, 195n. 170  
 Mratschek, S. 297n. 1  
 Müller, J. 322n. 126, 347n. 1, 34n. 13;  
 14; 16, 350n. 19  
 Myres, J.N.L. 60n. 108, 168n. 7; 10  
  
 Naab, E. 224n. 69  
 Niebergall, A. 14n. 42, 27n. 70,  
 30n. 85, 32n. 104, 33n. 107, 45n. 47,  
 54n. 89; 91, 57 f.n. 100, 60n. 109,  
 63n. 133, 64n. 136, 81n. 36, 82,  
 83n. 41, 96n. 36, 107n. 11  
 Nietzsche, F. 2, 171n. 22  
 Nuvolone, F.G. 169n. 11  
 Nygren, G. 83, 272n. 383, 285n. 459  
  
 O'Connell, R.J. 19n. 16, 22n. 34  
 O'Daly, G., 214n. 1, 347n. 1  
 O'Donnell, J.J. 8n. 5, 133n. 2; 4  
 Ogliari, D. 278n. 425; 426, 284n. 459,  
 286n. 465; 466, 287n. 468  
 O'Meara, J.J. 9n. 7  
 Oort, J. van 15 f.n. 1; 3, 25n. 54,  
 26 f.n. 57, 90n. 5, 105n. 2; 3; 5,  
 142n. 52, 268n. 357; 358, 303n. 25  
  
 Parsons, W. 147n. 77, 151n. 91; 92; 95,  
 210n. 238, 211n. 239, 214n. 2, 218n. 26,  
 220n. 38, 226n. 84, 227n. 88,  
 229n. 98, 230n. 104  
  
 Partoens, G. 232n. 119; 120  
 Perkams, M. 349n. 14  
 Perler, O. 69n. 1  
 Piauult, B. 205n. 221  
 Pich, R.H. 2n. 3, 347n. 1, 349n. 13; 14;  
 16, 350n. 19  
 Pincherle, A. 32n. 104, 50n. 68; 69,  
 57n. 99, 81n. 37, 89n. 3  
 Plagnieux, J. 164n. 21, 240n. 195  
 Platz, Ph. 50n. 69; 71, 57n. 99, 75n. 18  
 Plinval, G. de 22n. 34, 169n. 10; 11; 13,  
 19n. 140  
 Plumer, E. 62n. 123; 124  
 Pontifex, M. 19n. 18, 20n. 24; 26,  
 21n. 28, 22n. 31; 32; 35, 39n. 23,  
 40n. 27, 41n. 30, 42n. 33, 43n. 39,  
 44n. 40; 44  
 Puech, H.-Ch. 15n. 1, 324n. 137  
  
 Quinot, B. 89n. 5  
  
 Ramsey, B. 73n. 10; 12, 74n. 17,  
 75n. 19; 20, 76n. 21, 77n. 23, 78n. 24;  
 27, 79n. 28; 29, 80n. 32; 33; 35  
 Rebillard, E. 206n. 225, 312n. 76  
 Rees, B.R. 169n. 10  
 Refoulé, F. 172n. 26, 205n. 221,  
 297n. 2  
 Rettig, J.W. 114n. 71, 127n. 162,  
 128n. 169; 172, 129n. 176, 249n. 247,  
 252n. 274, 253n. 275; 278; 279  
 Ricoeur, P. 89n. 2  
 Ries, J. 16n. 3  
 Ring, T.G. 81n. 38, 287n. 475  
 Rist, J.M. 19n. 18, 39 f.n. 23, 83,  
 84n. 49; 50, 94n. 28, 145n. 67,  
 284n. 459, 326n. 143, 349n. 16  
 Rondet, H. 171n. 22, 284n. 459  
 Roy, O. du 19n. 16; 17, 39n. 18  
 Rudolph, K. 268n. 358, 303n. 25  
 Russell, R.P. 11n. 20; 21, 22n. 34,  
 39n. 23, 40n. 27, 41n. 28; 29, 42n. 32  
  
 Sage, A. 265n. 346, 284n. 459  
 Salamito, J.-M. 162n. 17  
 Schindler, A. 16n. 6, 133n. 1; 2,  
 134n. 8, 240n. 196

- Schmaus, M. 240n. 196, 244n. 221  
 Schmucker, J. 285n. 459  
 Scopello, M. 105n. 3, 325n. 137  
 Séjourné, P. 19n. 16  
 Sfameni Gasparo, G. 105n. 5, 111n. 50  
 Simonis, W. 133n. 2, 210n. 236  
 Smith, A.J. 170n. 14; 16  
 Soetard, M. 168n. 4  
 Solignac, A. 8n. 4, 12n. 25, 83, 89n. 4,  
 106n. 6, 168n. 4, 169n. 12, 170n. 17,  
 262n. 333, 283n. 455, 284n. 459,  
 285n. 464  
 Somers, H. 16n. 6  
 Sontag, F. 23n. 37  
 Sorabji, R. 347n. 1  
 Souter, A. 169n. 10; 13  
 Speigel, J. 164n. 21  
 Stein, M. 325n. 137  
 Strand, N. 103n. 71  
 Strauss, R. 87n. 67  
 Studer, B. 243n. 213, 263n. 338  
 Sullivan, J.E. 16n. 6, 240n. 196  
 Taranto, S. 286n. 466  
 Tardieu, M. 15n. 1, 37n. 10  
 Tauer, J. 169n. 13  
 TeSelle, E. 159n. 2, 160n. 5, 161n. 10,  
 167n. 4, 206n. 225, 219n. 35  
 Teske, R.J. 173n. 33, 175n. 43, 177n. 47,  
 180n. 69; 73, 183n. 89, 184n. 92; 94,  
 185n. 100, 186n. 103, 188n. 113; 114,  
 189n. 118; 119; 120, 192n. 153; 162,  
 194n. 166, 197n. 182, 201n. 202,  
 202n. 204; 205, 203n. 207; 209,  
 206n. 222; 223, 207n. 226; 231,  
 208n. 232; 233; 235, 222n. 58; 59,  
 223n. 60; 61, 279n. 432, 280n. 436;  
 440, 282n. 449; 451, 283n. 453,  
 284n. 456, 289n. 483; 484, 290n. 491,  
 291n. 496, 292n. 502; 504, 300n. 15,  
 301n. 16, 302n. 18, 305n. 39, 309n. 59,  
 314n. 82, 320n. 112; 113, 321n. 123,  
 323n. 131, 324n. 133; 136, 326n. 145;  
 146; 148, 327n. 151, 329n. 169; 170,  
 330n. 171, 333n. 197; 199  
 Testard, M. 7n. 1, 9n. 8, 272n. 385  
 Theiler, W. 7n. 3, 12n. 25  
 Thonnard, F.-J. 22n. 34, 102n. 70,  
 283n. 452, 284n. 459  
 Tornau, C. 101n. 64  
 Trapè, A. 4n. 10  
 Tullaye, J. de la 191n. 140  
 Valero, J.B. 170n. 17  
 Van Fleteren, F. 56n. 95  
 Vannier, M.-A. 26n. 57  
 Veer, A.C. de 221n. 43, 223n. 62,  
 316n. 97  
 Verschoren, M. 20n. 20  
 Vessey, M. 278n. 425  
 Voelke, A.-J. 22n. 34, 348n. 11,  
 349n. 14  
 Weaver, R.H. 278n. 425, 287n. 468  
 Weber, D. 25n. 54, 319n. 110  
 Weber, M. 162n. 17  
 Wermelinger, O. 15n. 1, 16n. 3,  
 25n. 54, 26n. 57, 58n. 100, 105n. 2;  
 3; 5, 159n. 1, 160n. 5, 162n. 16; 17,  
 163n. 18, 169n. 11; 13, 171n. 22,  
 191n. 140, 195n. 168, 268n. 358,  
 271n. 378, 303n. 25, 306n. 49,  
 308n. 53  
 Wetzel, J. 19n. 16  
 Wurst, G. 15n. 1, 16n. 3, 25n. 54,  
 26n. 57, 58n. 100, 105n. 2; 3; 5,  
 268n. 358, 303n. 25  
 Zeoli, A. 19n. 16, 53n. 86, 54n. 88,  
 57n. 99, 76n. 21, 83, 107n. 11  
 Zum Brunn, E. 32n. 100  
 Zumkeller, A. 142n. 51

### III

#### INDEX NOTIONUM

- adiutorium* 196, 258n. 313, 262n. 333,  
282n. 451, 283, 284n. 459, 292n. 502,  
322n. 126
- adoption 45, 47 f., 52, 63 f. 78, 164,  
229, 231, 253n. 276, 263, 318
- admonitio* 14n. 42, 54n. 89, 60n. 110, 150
- ἀκρασία 349
- amor* (see also love) 20n. 24, 23 f.,  
115, 241, 249, 259n. 319, 269, 277,  
308–310, 322n. 126
- angels 125, 216, 269, 271, 275–278,  
316, 349
- baptism(al) 47–49, 90n. 7, 134, 136–  
144, 147 f., 154 f., 160n. 6, 162n. 16,  
166, 172 f., 176 f., 179, 204–206, 208 f.,  
217 f., 221, 227, 233 f., 264, 288, 300,  
311–313, 315–318, 323, 334, 337
- beatitude, *beatitudo* (see also  
happiness) 9n. 9, 12–14, 19n. 16,  
40n. 28, 237n. 175, 247n. 233,  
250n. 251, 275n. 410
- body (see also *caro*, flesh)  
– body created as good 15, 17n. 7,  
303, 320  
– its relation to the soul (see also  
incarnation of the soul) 17, 21,  
23, 123, 159, 161n. 9, 173, 214–219,  
221 f., 233, 325n. 142  
– movement of the body 28, 118  
– an illness of the body 189, 193,  
314  
– mortal body, body of death,  
captivity of the body (see also  
flesh) 24, 31, 38, 108, 123, 173–  
175, 177, 179, 190, 194, 209, 214,  
234 f., 265, 299–302, 309 f., 314,  
316 f., 318, 336, 344  
– new / spiritual / resurrected  
body 31, 38, 173, 178, 234 f., 302,  
318  
– incarnation of Christ (see also  
incarnation) 15, 109, 124, 217,  
229, 311  
– body of Christ, body of the  
church 46 f., 64 f., 108, 110, 113,  
124, 130, 139, 141n. 50, 142n. 52,  
143, 146n. 72, 160n. 7, 229, 248,  
294 f., 323
- βῶλος 58n. 100
- calling (see also *vocatio*) 30, 32,  
33n. 108, 53 f., 58–60, 72, 75–78, 117,  
124, 258, 290
- caritas*, charity (see also love) 13,  
23 f., 47n. 53, 51n. 74, 55, 79, 114, 117,  
143–145, 164 f., 183n. 89, 193n. 162,  
201, 202n. 205, 206, 230, 244, 247,  
259n. 320, 265n. 345, 266n. 349,  
327n. 151
- caro* (see also body, flesh) 36,  
38n. 13; 14, 57n. 99, 73n. 12, 109,  
124, 128n. 169, 175, 177n. 47, 178,  
192n. 154, 208n. 235, 233 f., 235n. 153,  
237n. 175, 238n. 178, 255n. 290,  
256n. 295, 265n. 348, 283, 300n. 13,  
301n. 16, 302n. 18, 309, 314n. 85,  
315n. 89, 322n. 126
- charity see *caritas*, love
- Christology, Christological 32n. 104,  
83 f., 86 f., 98n. 49, 99n. 51, 108, 124,  
126n. 161, 127n. 165, 164n. 21, 171,  
227n. 89, 245n. 227, 263n. 338, 326
- church (see also body of Christ,  
ecclesiology) 30, 33n. 107; 108, 46,  
70 f., 109, 110n. 34; 35, 113, 115n. 82,

- 129, 133 f., 138–147, 150, 152–154,  
165, 197, 229, 235, 248, 269n. 361,  
274n. 397, 277, 289
- coercion 4, 145, 148 f., 345
- concupiscentia*, concupiscence (see  
also *cupiditas*, desire, *libido*) 20 f.,  
24, 31n. 99, 33, 51, 55, 73, 97, 115, 117,  
124n. 146, 127, 128n. 169, 129n. 177,  
174n. 34, 175, 177–179, 183, 187, 190,  
194 f., 200, 203 f., 208 f., 217, 227, 233–  
235, 237–239, 253n. 278, 255, 257,  
265, 283, 293 f., 299–307, 309–318,  
322, 325 f., 328 f., 331 f., 334–336,  
343 f., 350  
– good concupiscence 187, 254–  
256
- condemnation (see also *damnatio*,  
perdition) 127, 129n. 177, 137,  
162n. 16, 176 f., 180, 207, 213, 218 f.,  
221, 277, 292, 294, 301, 338
- conspario* see *massa*
- consuetudo*, habit 29n. 80, 35–40,  
55, 63, 73, 93 f., 96, 99, 151, 233, 259,  
265n. 347, 316, 322n. 126, 342
- contagion (of sin), contagious  
137n. 21, 140, 207, 208n. 232, 217,  
262, 305n. 43, 313 f., 332n. 185, 339
- corruptio*, rebuke 281, 285
- creatio*, creation 17, 25, 26n. 57, 33,  
47, 57, 58n. 100, 72, 89, 100, 102n. 66,  
119 f., 122, 129 f., 154, 167, 177, 186, 215 f.,  
222, 245, 269n. 366, 275 f., 288, 299,  
313, 322, 329, 331n. 178, 335n. 210, 336
- creationism, creationist 215, 219–  
222, 224
- cupiditas* (see also concupiscence,  
desire, *libido*) 18n. 15, 20 f., 24,  
26, 31, 47n. 53, 61n. 117, 73, 115,  
117n. 108, 201, 233, 245n. 227, 275,  
309, 331, 342  
– *cupiditas boni* 309
- damnatio*, *damnatus* (see also  
condemnation, perdition)  
57n. 99, 128n. 169, 176, 177n. 47,  
190n. 133, 206, 207n. 231, 208n. 233,  
210, 223, 263, 271n. 381, 329n. 169,  
333n. 196
- death 31, 38, 91, 109, 116, 123, 127, 139,  
146n. 72, 147, 160n. 5, 165 f., 172–176,  
178, 206, 209, 221, 234, 238, 261, 271,  
305n. 43, 318, 321, 328 f., 332, 336,  
339 f., 345  
– body of death (see also body)  
175, 234, 302, 310, 318, 344  
– Christ's death 152, 191, 234, 251,  
322n. 127  
– eternal / second death 173,  
207, 223, 271, 274, 320  
– death to sin 318
- deeds, works 27 f., 35, 42, 46, 48, 51–  
54, 56 f., 61, 65, 72, 74–77, 83, 86,  
116 f., 122, 183 196–198, 200–203, 206,  
209 f., 231, 265, 272, 275, 279–281,  
288, 294, 304, 311, 313, 315 f., 321, 347,  
348n. 10, 349n. 16, 350 f.
- deification, becoming God 23, 110,  
196, 253
- delectatio*, delight 18, 74, 79, 81n. 37,  
82 f., 95 f., 125, 149, 179 f., 182 f., 187,  
202, 204, 209, 230–232, 235, 238,  
249 f., 255–257, 259–261, 269, 275,  
282, 292n. 502, 303, 307–310, 312,  
336, 339, 343 f., 350
- desire (see also *concupiscentia*,  
*cupiditas*, *libido*) 18, 20–23,  
26, 29, 31–33, 35, 39, 46 f., 51, 55,  
90n. 7, 91n. 9, 92 f., 98 f., 114, 122, 149,  
183, 187, 194, 233, 254 f., 257, 275 f.,  
283, 286n. 466, 287, 301, 309,  
315, 317, 329, 334, 339–344, 348,  
349n. 16
- determinism 262n. 333, 272
- devil 26, 175, 177, 208, 268, 277, 294,  
299, 301, 303–305, 325
- difficultas*, difficulty 31, 33, 35, 40–43,  
57n. 99, 164, 271, 313, 340, 345
- dilectio* (see also love) 23, 63, 182,  
184n. 94, 244, 247n. 233, 248n. 241;  
243, 255, 308, 316n. 97
- dolor*, pain 31, 150n. 88, 230n. 104,  
328 f.n. 164, 345

- Donatist(s) 1, 3, 4n. 8, 50, 69, 85, 89,  
106n. 8; 9, 107n. 11, 115n. 82, 133–  
155, 160n. 6, 162, 167 f., 172, 176n. 46,  
220n. 41, 269n. 361, 345  
*dulcedo* see *suavitas*
- ecclesiology, ecclesiological 69,  
72n. 8, 83, 133n. 2, 141, 142n. 53, 144,  
147, 154  
*electio*, election 54, 76 f., 83, 89, 101,  
102n. 66, 252, 259n. 321, 266  
eschatology, eschatological 85, 99,  
124, 129, 142n. 53; 55, 143, 198, 205,  
221, 225, 268 f., 310, 340, 350  
evil 2, 9–11, 15 f., 18–20, 23, 26, 31,  
33, 35–37, 43, 52, 58n. 100, 81n. 36;  
38, 91 f., 108, 118, 146, 152n. 97, 171,  
191, 198, 201, 207, 210, 214, 230–232,  
239, 261 f., 264, 270, 276, 278n. 424,  
280, 282, 283n. 452, 287, 294, 299,  
301 f., 304–306, 309, 311–314, 317 f.,  
319n. 111, 324–326, 329–331, 333–335,  
345, 347–351  
*exemplum gratiae* 332
- faith, *fides* 2, 12 f., 29, 46, 50n. 70,  
52–54, 56, 58n. 101, 60–62, 64 f.,  
74n. 13, 75–79, 82 f., 107, 110, 112 f.,  
115, 124–128, 136, 138n. 21, 139n. 34,  
141, 145–147, 154, 164 f., 179, 181, 183–  
186, 197, 201 f., 206 f., 209, 238, 246,  
248, 250–252, 255, 257, 261, 265 f.,  
279–281, 286–291, 295, 308, 332, 338,  
342 f., 350  
fall,  
– of sin 29, 43, 57, 58n. 101,  
63n. 133, 73n. 11, 84, 98, 124, 245,  
262n. 333, 271, 274, 284n. 459,  
349  
– of the soul (see also body,  
incarnation, soul) 39, 159,  
161n. 9, 219n. 35  
φαντασία see *visum*  
Father 10n. 14, 24, 32, 47 f., 62 f., 110,  
127, 148, 151, 164, 243 f., 249, 252,  
263n. 338, 268n. 356, 289, 293  
flesh (see also body, *caro*) 36–38, 55,  
57, 73, 109, 124, 127 f., 165, 175–178,  
192, 208, 215, 221, 229, 232–235, 238,  
255, 271, 283, 300–302, 304, 309, 325,  
335, 344  
foreknowledge, *praescientia* 42, 53 f.,  
76, 103, 118–120, 153, 222, 252, 266,  
272, 288, 293  
forgiveness (see also remission) 60,  
64, 90n. 7, 126, 139, 144, 154, 167, 173,  
198 f., 201  
free choice (of will), *liberum arbitrium*  
13, 18–21, 23n. 37, 28, 30, 37–39, 43,  
51n. 75, 52 f., 64n. 136, 71, 74, 79,  
82, 95, 148, 149n. 82, 165, 167, 169 f.,  
178, 182, 184 f., 188–192, 194–200,  
236, 238, 251, 258–261, 262n. 333,  
271 f., 278–282, 283n. 552, 286 f., 294,  
301, 308, 310n. 66, 311, 313n. 80, 323,  
327n. 155, 333 f., 341–343  
– *liberum arbitrium captivum* (see  
also enslavement) 310, 324,  
334  
freedom 1, 18, 22n. 34, 30–32, 35n. 2,  
36n. 6, 39, 40n. 23, 51, 53, 61, 63, 69,  
78, 82 f., 86n. 66, 87n. 67, 107 f., 117,  
126 f., 129, 135n. 12, 145 f., 148 f., 184 f.,  
187, 192, 204, 209, 237, 239, 258–  
261, 272, 282, 283n. 452, 285n. 459;  
464, 294, 303, 306–308, 310, 319 f.,  
322–324, 327, 331, 333–337, 339–343,  
347n. 1, 350  
*frui*,  
– (*per*)*frui* 10, 31n. 98, 41n. 30,  
94n. 26, 114  
– *uti-frui* 114  
*gratis* 47, 61, 64, 92–94, 98, 112–115,  
126, 127n. 162, 130, 230 f., 246, 251,  
259n. 321, 290n. 486, 308, 332 f., 337  
– *gratis malus* 92, 349  
gratitude 29, 167, 184, 189, 231  
guilt(ty) (see also *reatus*) 26, 40 f.,  
108, 127, 137, 140, 147, 152, 159, 179,  
190, 256, 285n. 464, 299, 304, 316 f.,  
320 f., 326 f., 340

- inherited guilt 3, 45, 80 f.n. 35, 82, 86 f., 87n. 68, 91n. 11, 117, 122, 129, 159, 166, 174, 176n. 46, 177 f., 181, 208–210, 214 f., 217–219, 223, 233, 264, 289, 293, 298n. 2, 300 f., 305 f., 312–316, 318, 329 f., 332 f., 336, 338 f., 345, 350
- habit see *consuetudo*
- Holy Spirit (see also pneumatology) 15 f., 24, 28, 31–33, 47 f., 51–53, 60, 64 f., 72, 101n. 64, 109n. 26, 122, 138 f., 141n. 50, 143 f., 147, 154, 165, 182 f., 185, 187, 190, 193, 197, 200 f., 206, 222, 229, 236–238, 242–245, 247 f., 250, 253 f., 257, 262, 265, 279, 289, 293, 332n. 185, 337
- happiness (see also beatitude) 9 f., 12, 16, 18, 21–25, 41, 43–45, 56, 98 f., 101, 173, 182, 227, 231, 237, 242, 247, 254, 267, 270, 274 f., 342, 348
- homo spiritualis* 31
- human nature, human condition 16, 19n. 18, 27, 29, 32, 57n. 99, 63, 92, 131, 166, 172, 178, 182 f., 185, 187–192, 194, 199–201, 205–207, 209, 235, 238 f., 255, 257, 264, 287, 289, 297n. 2, 298 f., 301, 303, 306, 311–322, 325, 328n. 161, 329, 334–337, 340 f., 345
- humility 59, 61 f., 64, 90n. 8, 108, 125 f., 128, 167, 231, 285n. 464
- ignorance 39–43, 102, 165, 188, 190, 196, 203, 208 f., 237, 279, 332, 348n. 10
- illuminate, illumination 12n. 34, 23, 47, 111n. 43, 118, 201, 323
- image,
  - image of God in man, *imago* (see also *similitudo*) 16–18, 49, 58, 182n. 82, 216, 239–243, 245, 247 f., 274, 275n. 405, 281, 293, 322 f., 324n. 133
  - fantasy image see *visum*
- immortality, *immortalitas* 47n. 53, 126, 234 f., 246, 308n. 54
- incarnation (see also body),
  - of Christ 8, 30, 32, 62–64, 110n. 35, 229, 231, 243 f., 263n. 338, 274n. 397, 322, 336 f., 339
  - of the soul (see also fall, reincarnation, soul) 206, 219
- intellect, *intellectus* V, 17, 18n. 12, 30n. 85, 74, 148, 149n. 82, 240 f.n. 198, 241, 268n. 356, 347n. 1
  - *intellectus gratiae* 82, 86, 90n. 6, 94n. 28, 96n. 36, 107n. 11, 129n. 176, 230 f., 337
- Jews, Jewish 51n. 72, 59, 63, 74 f., 112, 116, 138n. 32, 237, 322
- justice (see also righteousness) 38, 42, 54n. 89; 91, 60n. 108, 82, 146, 148 f., 168, 230, 326 f.
  - of God 17, 19, 21, 60, 80, 98, 102, 103n. 71, 116, 127, 210, 237, 280
  - of man 29, 52, 112, 126, 237
- justify, justification 51 f., 54, 58, 60n. 110, 61, 75 f., 78, 81n. 37, 110, 116, 121, 124, 126, 128, 136, 176, 182n. 82, 183 f., 186, 198, 227, 245, 257, 259, 262, 274, 279, 312, 338
- knowledge (see also *scientia*) 7, 9 f., 12 f., 32, 40, 64n. 135, 90, 94n. 28, 96, 99n. 51, 127, 129, 162n. 16, 165 f., 182, 184, 196, 202 f., 211, 226 f., 256 f., 317, 336, 344, 349n. 16
- law (see also order) 12 f., 20, 22 f., 26, 30, 32, 92 f., 123, 125n. 152, 182n. 82, 189 f., 232, 238, 316, 330, 341
  - of Moses 15, 29, 38, 46, 50–52, 55, 59, 61–64, 72, 74, 85, 94, 107 f., 112, 114, 117, 127, 138n. 32, 160n. 5, 165, 167, 170, 171n. 22, 182–184, 187, 195–199, 202, 228 f., 232, 235–239, 248, 256 f., 259, 264n. 341, 265, 279, 281, 302n. 21, 303, 308–312, 322, 335 f., 340, 344



law (*cont.*)

- of sin (“in my members”) 38, 55 f., 93, 123, 125n. 152, 190, 198, 235, 238, 259, 299 f., 307, 310, 316, 324, 326, 328
- of human society 11, 135n. 9, 145–148, 150, 319

*liberum arbitrium* see free choice of will

*libido*, libidinous (see also *concupiscentia*, *cupiditas*) 3, 11n. 20, 20 f., 24, 39, 93 f., 123 f., 129 f., 175, 181, 207, 209 f., 233, 261, 299–301, 304–306, 314, 317, 328n. 164, 329, 335, 339, 342, 345

love (see also *amor*, *caritas*, *dilectio*) 16, 23–25, 33, 38, 47 f., 51–53, 55, 61–65, 74, 81, 101n. 64, 108, 112–117, 122, 130, 138 f., 142n. 50, 143–147, 151 f., 154, 165 f., 182–185, 187, 190, 200–203, 206, 210, 228–232, 238, 243 f., 246n. 229, 247–251, 253–257, 259–261, 264n. 341, 265, 268 f., 277, 280, 293 f., 308 f., 316, 335–337, 340, 342–344, 347n. 1, 349, 351

- of self 81n. 37, 269, 277

lump see *massa*

Manichaeism(s), Manichaeism 2, 8, 15 f., 18 f., 23, 25, 26n. 57, 33, 36–38, 56, 58n. 100, 74, 89, 91n. 9, 92, 105, 107 f., 111, 115n. 84, 124, 130, 163, 171, 182, 214 f., 224, 228, 232, 239, 254, 268n. 357; 358, 270, 303–307, 310–314, 318, 324–326, 331n. 178, 332n. 182, 335, 338, 340

*massa*, mass, lump, *conspario* 57 f., 80 f., 102, 109, 124, 152, 210, 263

measure see *modus*

*meritum*, merit(s) 2 f., 13 f., 22, 25, 28, 43, 46–48, 52, 55 f., 59–62, 64, 75 f., 81, 83, 86, 101 f., 107 f., 112, 116, 119, 124–127, 130, 136, 165, 179–181, 183, 195, 197 f., 206, 210, 219, 245–247, 251 f., 259, 262 f., 266, 280 f., 286n. 466, 287–290, 292, 308, 311, 313, 337 f., 343

- *occult(issim)a merita* 58, 102

*misericordia* 80n. 32, 90n. 7, 210

*modus*, measure 9 f., 12 f., 30, 33n. 107, 112

mortality 30 f., 33, 35 f.n. 2, 72–74, 80n. 35, 86, 98, 108–110, 117, 124, 162n. 16, 172 f., 175, 177, 208 f., 246, 255, 321, 332

*necessitas*, necessity 18n. 14, 25, 28, 37 f., 93 f., 119 f., 151n. 94, 188, 191 f., 210, 234, 273, 320, 324, 326 f., 334, 337, 341

Neoplatonic, Neoplatonism, Neoplatonising (see also Platonic) 8, 9n. 8, 14n. 43, 19n. 16, 30n. 84, 33n. 108, 84, 95n. 29, 98n. 49, 99n. 51, 100n. 54

*nihil*, nothing(ness) 31, 32n. 100, 42, 58n. 100, 101, 220, 262n. 334, 266, 270, 271n. 376, 275n. 411, 276n. 413; 414, 277, 322n. 126, 325 f.n. 143, 331n. 178, 339–341, 345

*ordo*, order (see also law) 7, 9–12, 14, 18–20, 21n. 27, 26 f., 30–33, 42 f., 45, 54n. 89, 81, 101, 121, 145 f., 272 f., 278n. 424, 341

pain see *dolor*

Paraclete 15

*peccatum* see sin

Pelagian(s) 1–4, 16, 85, 87, 97, 159, 161–166, 168n. 7; 10, 171n. 22; 23, 172, 176n. 46, 178, 182, 187, 191, 203, 205n. 221, 220 f., 235–237, 239, 265, 278n. 426, 281, 286, 291, 297n. 2, 298 f., 303, 306–308, 310–313, 316–318, 328, 331, 343

penitence, penitent, repentance 60 f., 64, 116, 167, 198 f.

perdition (see also condemnation, *damnatio*) 58n. 100, 81, 165, 173 f., 177, 180, 205–207, 209 f., 277, 282, 285, 295, 314

perseverance 285, 287, 295

- Platonic, Platonist(s) (see also Neoplatonic) 7 f., 24n. 50, 93n. 24, 94n. 28, 110, 206, 214, 219n. 35, 268n. 356, 271, 317  
 – books of the Platonists 2, 7, 71, 93, 99n. 51
- pleasure see *voluptas*
- pneumatology, pneumatological  
 16n. 3, 64n. 135, 76n. 22, 84, 100n. 54, 108, 182n. 81, 246n. 229, 247n. 235
- poena* (see also punishment, *supplicium*) 28, 31, 39 f., 73, 123, 210, 263, 330
- praemium* (see also reward) 24, 113n. 67, 114n. 71, 245
- praescientia* (see also foreknowledge) 53n. 84, 54, 21n. 76, 103, 118–120, 153, 272n. 387, 288
- praedestinatio*, predestination 54, 81n. 36, 101, 103, 118, 210, 288–290
- pride (see also *superbia*) 26, 33, 46, 59, 61 f., 74 f., 82, 86, 124–126, 152 f., 171n. 22, 180, 237, 246, 251, 269, 271, 276, 283, 338 f., 347n. 1
- procreation 3, 27, 123 f., 129 f., 159, 174n. 34, 175, 181, 188, 207–210, 227, 233, 261, 299–301, 304–306, 314, 320, 322, 325, 329, 335, 339, 345
- providentia*, providence 28, 30, 32, 54n. 89, 57, 117–119
- punishment (see also *poena*, *supplicium*) 3, 13, 21–23, 28, 31, 33, 38, 40 f., 43, 62, 64, 73, 80 f., 86, 102, 108, 114, 117 f., 123 f., 127, 146, 166, 173 f., 178, 186, 189 f., 192, 199, 205, 209 f., 214, 236, 256, 262–264, 271, 277, 288, 294, 300, 308, 314, 316, 321, 328–332, 335 f., 339, 345
- prayer 13, 48, 90, 91n. 9, 92, 165
- ratio* 17, 20, 25 f., 216, 241n. 198, 274, 322, 323n. 131, 329, 330n. 171, 342  
 – *rationes aeternae* 240n. 198  
 – *rationes seminales* 119, 216
- reatus* (see also guilt) 137, 177, 208, 218, 233, 264, 315
- rebuke see *correptio*
- reincarnation 268n. 356
- remission (see also forgiveness) 176 f., 204–206, 209, 311 f., 317, 323
- resurrection 32, 49n. 64, 160n. 5, 178 f., 195, 218, 221n. 46
- reward (see also *praemium*) 13 f., 19, 22–25, 28, 47, 61 f., 64, 76, 108, 112–114, 124, 126, 179, 182, 228, 230, 245, 251, 261 f., 264n. 341, 279 f., 311
- righteousness (see also justice) 46, 56, 61 f., 64, 74, 147, 149, 182, 190, 197, 207, 251, 256, 259, 261, 275, 280 f., 308 f., 312, 327, 332
- Rogatian(s) 150, 220
- sacramenta*, sacrament(s), sacramental, sacramentology 4n. 8, 61, 71, 72n. 8, 82, 133 f., 136–141, 143 f., 154, 218
- salvation 56, 59, 81, 112, 119 f., 136–141, 143, 153, 171, 179, 182, 184, 190, 210, 218, 250 f., 253, 274, 276 f., 285, 292, 294, 306, 310 f., 318, 322, 338 f.  
 – history / economy of salvation 29 f., 55, 244n. 221
- sceptical, scepticism 7, 8n. 5, 9
- scientia* (see also knowledge) 12, 13n. 35, 256, 317
- sexual(ity) 123, 299, 301, 303, 306, 322n. 124, 325, 329, 335, 340
- shame(ful) 175, 207, 233, 299, 304 f., 322 f., 325, 329, 335
- sin, *peccatum* V, 20, 22n. 34, 26, 31, 33, 35, 40 f., 42, 51, 55, 61, 73, 81, 91 f., 103, 109, 134, 137n. 21, 174, 177, 188 f., 191–195, 230, 254, 260, 264, 275, 301 f., 304, 309 f., 313, 315, 320, 326, 327n. 150, 330, 333, 335, 344  
 – Adam's sin 26n. 62, 27, 37, 51, 58, 160n. 5, 173, 195, 204, 282  
 – the sin of schism 140 f., 144, 146  
 – inherited sin 24, 42, 56n. 95, 63, 82, 91, 96, 109n. 28, 122, 124, 127, 128, 129 f., 152, 154, 159n. 3, 161n. 9, 163, 166, 172, 174–178,

- inherited sin (*cont.*) 204–210, 217–219, 221, 223, 261, 264, 286, 299 f., 304–306, 308, 311 f., 314, 320, 343, 350
- the law of sin see law
- the mass of sin 57, 80, 124
- natural and voluntary sin 117
- *peccatum originale* 72 f., 92, 165, 176, 189, 204, 210, 255, 289
- sinless(ness) 125, 160n. 5, 161n. 9, 162n. 16, 165 f., 169, 172, 174n. 34, 178 f., 188, 191–196, 201, 313
- of Christ 229, 234 f., 262, 263n. 338, 289, 294, 305n. 43, 306, 311 f., 317, 322, 332n. 182
- inability to sin (*non posse peccare*) 261 f., 283, 284n. 459, 294, 350
- similitudo* (see also *imago*) 16, 49, 240n. 198, 241
- enslavement, enslaved 280n. 343, 299, 316, 319, 324, 331 f., 334–336, 341 f., 343 f., 351
- Son see Father
- soul 8n. 4, 16–18, 23 f., 28, 37–39, 42, 109, 111, 173, 174n. 36, 196, 228 f., 233, 237, 242n. 208, 245, 271, 311, 317, 325
  - pre-existence / origin of the individual souls (see also fall of the soul, incarnation of the soul) 21, 41, 122 f., 159, 161n. 9, 177 f., 206, 213–224, 268n. 356, 293, 329n. 169
  - the soul of Christ 217
  - world soul 100
- Stoicism, Stoic(s) 2, 8, 19n. 16, 22n. 34, 91n. 9, 161n. 9, 170, 171n. 22, 194n. 164, 215, 219n. 35, 237, 272, 283n. 455, 297n. 2, 317, 321, 347n. 1, 348, 349n. 14; 16
- superbia* (see also pride) 26, 62n. 124, 125n. 159, 180n. 73, 251, 269, 276n. 415
- supplicium* (see also *poena*, punishment) 22n. 35, 40, 41n. 29, 52n. 83, 80, 126n. 162, 199, 223n. 61, 277n. 419, 300n. 15, 301, 326n. 146
- suavitas, dulcedo*, sweetness 2, 38, 95 f., 102, 183, 187, 202–204, 256 f., 294, 309, 340, 343–345, 351
- traduccionism, traduccionist 123n. 141, 151n. 2, 215, 219–224, 293, 325, 327n. 153, 332n. 182
- Trinity 24, 49n. 64, 105, 107, 239–241, 243 f., 268n. 356
- violence 3 f., 28, 83 f., 135n. 11; 12, 145n. 67, 146n. 72, 147 f., 151 f.
- visum* 29, 44, 342 f.
- virtus*, virtue 12 f., 23–25, 29, 36, 54, 110, 188, 190, 194n. 164, 198, 201, 203, 205, 209, 237, 259, 274, 291, 298, 303, 316n. 96, 319 f., 321n. 122, 327
- vocatio* (see also calling) 53 f., 59n. 104, 60, 77 f., 117, 185, 279n. 431, 290
- voluntas*, will *passim* (see also free choice),
  - distinction between *voluntas* and *liberum arbitrium* 19 f.n. 18, 280 f.n. 440
  - enslaved will see enslavement, *liberum arbitrium capitivum*
- voluptas*, pleasure 36, 38, 73, 92, 95 f., 113 f., 123, 230, 237, 248 f., 283, 291, 320, 344
- works see deeds